

VINDICATION

OF

Mr. George Buchanan

In Two Parts.

Part I. Vindicating him from the vile Aspersions cast on him by *Camden*, That he repented, when dying, of what he wrote against *Mary Queen of Scots*: Which Falshood has been since retailed and propagated by *Messieurs Sage* and *Ruddiman*.

Part II. Vindicating him from the horrible Ingratitude he is charged with to *Q. Mary*, in extolling her so high in his Dedication of his Paraphrase of the Psalms, and thereafter writing so bitterly against her in the Detection and History.

WITH,

An APPENDIX, Containing a Letter from the Illustrious *Monf. de Thou* President of the Parliament of *Paris*, to *Mr. William Camden*, relating to *Q. Mary's* Reign, and apologizing for his following *Buchanan* in his Narration thereof: With a Translation of that Letter.

Ω' χερσὶν Ἀμαρύνῃ, μὲν σέθεν ἐδὲ θανόντας
Λαοσύνεθ'

THEOCRIT.

Pierides. Vos hæc facietis maxima Gallo:
Gallo, cujus Amor tantum mihi crescit in horas,
Quantum Vere novo viridis se subjicit Alnus. VIRG.

EDINBURGH:

Printed by *Thomas Lumisden and Company*, and sold by
the Booksellers in Town. M.DCC.XLIX.

VINDICATION

OF
Mr. George Buchanan

In Two Parts.

Part I. Vindicating him from the imputation of being a man of blood, that he repented of when dying of what he wrote against Mary Queen of Scots, which falsehood has been so often repeated by malicious persons.

Part II. Vindicating him from the horrible charge of being a man of blood, in relation to the execution of his father, and the other writings to which he is charged with.



AN APPENDIX, containing a list of the names of the persons who have been charged with the execution of his father, and the other writings to which he is charged with.

By James Buchanan, Esq. Barrister at Law.

Printed by James Buchanan, Esq. Barrister at Law, in the Strand, near the Temple.

EDINBURGH:

Printed by James Buchanan, Esq. Barrister at Law, in the Strand, near the Temple.

To the Honourable,

JOHN OSBURN *Esq;*

Late Lord Provost of *Edinburgh*, Preses;

AND

To the other Honourable,
Reverend, Worthy and
Loyal Members of the
REVOLUTION-CLUB,
in the City of *Edinburgh*.

GENTLEMEN,

THE Design of forming your
Society and Club at first, a
little after the Revolution,
and which has subsisted ever since,
was, to perpetuate the Memory of
the most glorious Event, that ever
hap-

iv DEDICATION.

happened to *Great Britain*, for her Religion, Liberty, Property, Peace and Prosperity; I mean the late glorious Revolution; when K. *James VII.* was not only depriving his Subjects of their just Rights, Privileges and Liberty, and introducing arbitrary Power and despotic Government; but also bringing in *Popery* * into the Kingdom, by openly and violently breaking through the Barriers of all the Laws made in Favour of the established Protestant Religion. This being the noble Design of your Institution, I could not think of more proper Persons, to whose Protection I could offer the following Vindication of

* *Dum religionem Pontificiam, quam exsul cum fratre agens adolescens admodum addidicerat (PERRUPTIS, quæ id prohibebant, LEGUM OMNIUM REPAGULIS; denuo apud suos instaurare adniteretur, de folio deturbatus est.* This is Part of that Prince's Character by Mr. *Ruddiman*, in his *Series Regum Scotia Chronologica*, before *Anderson's Diplomata*, Page 91.

DEDICATION. V

of our incomparable Countryman, the Great George Buchanan. His famous DIALOGUE, *De jure Regni apud Scotos*, contains the most solid Principles of Government, founded on Reason, the Nature of human Society, Justice, and the Constitution of the Kingdom, according to which the Nation proceeded at the late Happy Revolution, which you so joyfully commemorate. The Decency, good Order, and Sobriety observed at your Meetings, has encouraged many of great Quality, Distinction and Worth in this Part of the Nation, to join in your Club. That the Memory of King WILLIAM, our glorious Deliverer, may never be forgot : That your Society and Club may ever continue in a flourish-

vi DEDICATION.

flourishing Way, and that you may be constantly instilling into the young Members of your Club, true loyal Revolution Principles, in Opposition to these who are disaffected to our present happy Constitution in Church and State ; is the ardent Wish, and most sincere Prayer of,

GENTLEMEN,

Your most humble Servant,

The AUTHOR.

A



A
VINDICATION
 OF
Mr. George Buchanan.

PART I.

Vindicating him from the vile Aspersions cast on him by Camden, that he repented, when dying; of what he wrote against Mary Queen of Scots; which Falshood, has been since retailed and propagated by Messieurs Sage and Ruddiman.



OUR celebrated Countryman, the great George Buchanan, was, undoubtedly, one of the greatest Men that made a Figure in the learned World, after the Restoration of Learning. And, tho' he has acquired immortal Honour to

his Country, by his never enough to be admired Works, in most of which he equals, and in some surpasses even the ancient *Romans* themselves; such is the Purity of his Diction, the Sublimity of Thought, and Elegance of Expression, that eminently appear thro' the whole of them: However such is the Malevolence of our high flying Writers, Men devoted to flavish, wild and inconsistent Principles, that they daily tear in Pieces his Character, and will not suffer him to rest in his Grave. Mr. *Ruddiman*, in his Notes on *Buchanan's* Life, declares, That he inclines to believe, what *Camden* has reported of *Buchanan's* Repentance, to be true; and in his late Answer to the Reverend Mr. *Logan*, that Affair is again revived by him with some bitter Reflections upon that great Man. This, I own, provoked my Indignation, and raised my Curiosity to enquire into the Proofs, these Writers had, or pretended to have, for what they so confidently assert on this Head. The first who invented, and published this Story of *Buchanan's* Repentance, was *Camden*, in his Annals of Queen *Elisabeth* (a); whose Account of that Matter, I shall give the Reader in his own Words; "When *Buchanan*, says he, forced by Party Zeal and

(a) *Ad Annum 1567.*

“ and the Earl of *Murray*’s Generosity, had
 “ writ his History, in such a Manner, that
 “ these Books were condemned of Falshood
 “ by the Parliament of *Scotland*; whose
 “ Credit is more to be depended on; and
 “ he himself fetching deep Sighs before
 “ the King, whose Præceptor he was, now
 “ and then blamed himself (AS I HEARD)
 “ that he had writ in so virulent a Manner
 “ against the Queen that deserved so well;
 “ and when dying, he wish’d he might
 “ live so long, as to wipe away, even with
 “ his Blood, the Stains he had falsely
 “ thrown upon her Character, in a flande-
 “ rous Manner; by recalling the Truth:
 “ But that (he said) this was needless, fee-
 “ ing he would be thought doating be-
 “ cause of his Age.” *Nicolson* Bishop of
Garlisle, tho’ thro’ the whole of his *Scottish*
historical Library, he writes pretty much
 upon the high flying Stile; yet after giving
 this Story from *Camden*, he passes this Joke
 upon it; “ This looks, says he (b), like
 “ a charitable Account of the last Minutes
 “ of his dying Enemy.”

Fam. Strada, a Romantic enough Writer,
 according to Mr. *Sage*; as we shall see after-
 wards, in his *Bello Belgico* (c), relates
 much the same Thing about *Buchanan*’s

B

Re-

(b) Folio Edition, Pag. 57. (c) *ad Annum* 1587.

Repentance ; but, as he has taken his Accounts from *Camden*, as Mr. *Ruddiman* owns, we shall concern ourselves no farther with him. But here I wonder much Mr. *Ruddiman* did not subjoin to *Strada*, *Robert Johnston's* Testimony (*d*), who no Doubt had it from *Camden*, as well as the other. The Improvement *Johnston* has made upon *Camden's* Hearsay, has made him ashamed to mention it. He says, " Before *Buchanan* died, a late Repentance for his reproachful and immoderately free Speech possessing his Mind, whether from a Fault of his Nature, or from Custom, he judged his Book deserved to be burnt." An ar-rant Falshood to be sure, and worthy of the greatest Contempt. Did not *Buchanan* undertake the Writing of his History, at the earnest Request and Solicitation of the most respectful and honourable Persons of his Country ? And does he not, in his Dedication of that Work to the King, 29th *August* 1582, scarce a Month, says Mr. *Ruddiman*, before his Death, mention their Reasons for inducing him to a Compliance, viz. That his other Works, meaning his poetical Pieces, were but *levioris Operæ libelli*, inconsiderable or trifling Pieces, in Comparison of the History of his Country ?

And

(*d*) Hist. Rer. Britan. Lib. III. ad Annum 1582.

And does he not in his Letter (e) to Mr. *Daniel Rogers*, a very considerable Man at Queen *Elisabeth's* Court, express himself somewhat unconcerned for his poetical Pieces, in Comparison of his History, which he was then writing? And was there not a grand Expectation of this Work, not only in *Britain*, but over all the learned World? Is *Johnston's* Invention then to be believed?

But to return to *Camden*. It will be necessary to open up his Character a little, before we particularly examine into this his *Hearsay* of *Buchanan's* Repentance.

Mr. *William Camden* was made one of the Ushers of *Westminster* School, founded by Queen *Elisabeth*, in which Station he served many Years, and afterwards was made chief Master of that School, and at last was made, by Queen *Elisabeth*, Anno 1597, *Clarencieux* King at Arms. He was without Doubt, a great Scholar, and an excellent Antiquary. His *Britannia* acquired him great Reputation both at home and abroad. At *Cecil's* Desire, he began his *Annals* of Queen *Elisabeth*, but after her Death, laid it aside for some Time; and had he dropt it altogether thereafter, it had been much for that Queen's Honour, and

B 2

his

his own Reputation. He resumed this Work again in King *James's* Reign, and it was published, *Anno* 1615, not without the Direction of that Prince, who is said, by several Authors, to have curtailed and interpolated that Work, then published (f); King *James* wishing, as *Monf. Bayle* says, to have Queen *Elisabeth's* Reign blackned rather than his own Mother Queen *Mary's*. And tho' *Camden* was under a Thousand Obligations to Queen *Elisabeth* and her Court; yet, continues *Bayle*, he sacrificed the Glory of that illustrious Princess, his Benefactress, to the Affection he had for King *James*, then on the Throne. He was an Enemy to the *Scots Presbyterians* or *Puritans*, as they were then called; and a mortal Enemy to *Buchanan*, whom he extremely vilified, says Bishop *Nicolson*; and that not only because he was a *Scots Puritan*, but out of Envy, very probably, because he could not in his Writings come near his elegant *Roman* Stile. To sum up his Character in

a

(f) It would appear *Camden* himself repented of having his *Annals* interpolated by King *James*; for it is certainly known, and Mr. *Smith* the Writer of his Life acknowledges it, that he sent the 2d Vol. to be published after his Death, to *Paris* to *Pierre du Puy*; besides, *Rigaltius*, in the Life of this Gentleman, as quoted by *Bayle*, says, That *Camden* sent him the 2d Volume of his *Annals*, which the Author durst not publish in his own Life Time. See also Dr. *Burnet* against *Varillas*, Pag. 60. *Amsterdam*, *Anno* 1688.

a few Words, he was, *Omnium scenarum homo*, a great Temporizer.

From this Account of *Camden*, the Reader is not to expect civil Usage from him to *Buchanan*.

This Story of *Buchanan's* Repentance, *Camden* does not assert as a Thing certain; it is a *Hearsay*, *ut accepi*, says he, but he does not tell from whom. One cannot however, but admire Mr. *Ruddiman's* ready Invention and Contrivance, at so great Distance of Time, in supplying that Defect, as he inclined to be of *Camden's* Opinion, by telling us, "He might have heard it " from the King, or from others who " were present when *Buchanan* said so." As to King *James*, I frankly own, I never had any great Notion of his Veracity, while he reigned in *Scotland*: For, after he took the Reins of Government into his own Hands, he was always of so fickle and inconstant a Way, ever guided and influenced by some one or other of his Favourites at Court, some of whom were but very indifferent Men, that he could never be depended on. And not to mention the Affair of *Gowrie's* Conspiracy, his signing a particular Order and Warrant, for razing out Leaves from the Registers of the *General Assembly*, is no great Sign, that he inclined

clined the Truth should be handed down to Posterity. The original Order was some Years ago produced and read before the *General Assembly*, and thereafter appointed to be laid up among the Records of the Church, where it now may be seen. *Adamson*, A Bishop of *St. Andrews*, was the Person employed in that dirty Work. See *Hist. motuum Scotiæ, Dantisci*, 1641, P. 86. But after he went to *England*, his Veracity was still less to be depended on; witness his practising upon the illustrious President, *Monf. de Thou*, by *Camden*, and that mercenary Hireling he kept, *Isaac Casaubon*, to conceal and pervert the Truth, with respect to his Mother and her Conduct, in the History of his own Time he was then writing. *Mr. Ruddiman*, in his Character of *King James VI. (g)*, owns, "That his Reign in *England* was with less Firmness of Mind and Fortitude than was meet;" *licet*, says he, *minore quam par erat animi constantia & fortitudine*; and he might have said the same for him, while in *Scotland*, if he had pleased.

In the first Place, *Camden* does not say he had this Story from the King; but supposing he had got it from the King, the King was

(g) *Series Regum Scotiæ Chronologica*, before *Anderson's Diplomata*, Pag. 90.

was too much a Party in this Cause ; and therefore *Camden's* Information is not to be relied on : Besides, it is highly improbable, that the King should have told him any such Thing ; because in his *Basilicon Doron*, where he is dissuading his Son, Prince *Henry*, from reading *Buchanan's Libelli Famosi*, he does not give the least Hint of it, and there he had a fine Opportunity of doing it, had it been true. He advises him indeed to be a *Pythagorean*, " and to believe that the seditious Souls of those Writers, pass into those who conceal their Books, or defend their Opinions." Mr. *Ruddiman* puts his Thumb upon this last Advice ; an Advice indeed, that the more antient and wiser *Solomon*, the Son of *David*, would not have given his Son. Neither is there the least Hint of *Buchanan's* pretended Repentance, in that so much talk'd of Act of Parliament, *Anno* 1584, that condemn'd his History and Dialogue ; and their Silence on that Head, is almost a Demonstration of the Falshood of *Camden's* Story ; for had it been true, and they had said so, it would have given a greater Sanction to that Act, than their Authority did give it. But, lastly, *Camden* is, in this Hearsay of his, flatly contradicted by the Author of *Thuanus Restitutus*, and by *Varillas*. The first, Mr.

Rud-

Ruddiman rejects (*h*), "because he brings
 " no proper Voucher for what he says."
 Very well! But is not *Camden* to be rejected
 by the same Rule; for he adduces no Vou-
 cher for what he says? Yes certainly, and
Mr. Ruddiman would have done so in this
 Case, had he not been determined at any
 Rate to believe this *Hearsay* of *Camden*:
 And I am tempted to think he believes
 here, by Inclination not by Reason. *Varillas*
 also is rejected by *Mr. Ruddiman*,
 "because he is inconsistent with himself;
 " for in his Preface he says, that Matter
 (the denying *Buchanan's* Repentance)
 " was wrote on the Margin of *Thuanus's*
 " History by the younger *Puteanus*; and
 " yet in the Book itself, he says it was
 " done by *Thuanus's* own Hand;" and
 therefore, in a magisterial Way, he very
 gravely pronounces him, *sublestæ fidei Au-*
thor, an Author not to be credited. If In-
 consistency be a sure Criterion for such a
 harsh Censure, I doubt *Mr. Ruddiman* will
 come off but badly himself, for which I
 refer the Reader to the Reverend *Mr. Lo-*
gan's late Performance, *Mr. Ruddiman* Self-
condemn'd. I do not see such great Incon-
 sistency here in *Varillas*; for, at first, he
 might take it for *Thuanus's* own Hand Wri-
 ting,

ting, and afterwards, when writing his Preface, he might more certainly know, that it was the Hand-writing of the younger *Puteanus*. To me, and I'm persuaded, to every unprejudiced Mind, it is a Proof of *Varillas's* Honesty and Candour, even tho' he omitted the acquainting the World, as ought to have been done, that he formerly took it for *Thuanus's* own Hand: And if it was the Hand-writing of the younger *Puteanus*, it is no small Confirmation of the Falshood of *Camden's Hearsay*. The Credit of the Author of *Thuanus Restitutus*, is not a little confirmed, by the Passage now being given us entire, as quoted by Mr. *Ruddiman*, in *Buckley's* late splendid Edition of *Thuanus's* History, Vol. IV. Pag. 100, *ad An.* 1582, in the Foot Margin, under the Title of *Var. Lect.* But then what he subjoins, abundantly establishes it, viz. *Germania, MS. Samm. Pat. & Rig.*

But what especially determines Mr. *Ruddiman* to believe *Camden's Hearsay* about *Buchanan's* Repentance, is Mr. *Sage's Suffrage*, as he calls it; and any Thing from that Quarter has great Weight with him. After I had read the Account Mr. *Ruddiman* gives from Mr. *Sage's* Suffrage or Testimony, about *Buchanan's* Repentance, I got *Sage's* Life into my Hands; after read-

ing of which, I find Mr. *Ruddiman's* Compend of it imperfect, and several Things left out, that possibly may give Light to the Discovery of this pious Piece of Fraud; and therefore I shall give the Reader the whole of it.

The *Publisher*, not the Author, of Mr. *Sage's* Life, residing, as it would appear at *London*, Pag. 70. tells us, he thinks it not amiss to subjoin a Letter, which he had importuned Mr. *Sage* to write, and which Letter, he says, bears Date, 17th *October* 1709, that is, about one Year and eight Months before Mr. *Sage* died, and this Gentleman publishes it at *London*, *An.* 1714, three Years after his Death. This being premised, the Copy of the Letter follows, so far as it concerns *Buchanan* (i).

S I R,

“ About 28 Years ago, I had Occasion,
“ at Mr. *Drummond* of *Innermay's* House in
“ *Strathern*,

(i) The other Part of that Letter, relates to the Repentance of that great Man Mr. *Alexander Henderson*, for supposed Injuries he had done to King *Charles I.* This famous Man was first Minister of *Leuchars* in the Presbytery of *St. Andrews*, Moderator of the General Assembly at *Glasgow*, *An.* 1638, afterwards Minister of *Edinburgh*, and Correspondent from this Church to the *Westminster* Assembly. I hope some of our learned Clergy will do Justice to the Memory of that famous Man, and vindicate him from that vile Aspersions.

“ *Strathern*, to be in Conversation with an
 “ antient Lady (the Lady *Rafyth* in *Fife*)
 “ a Woman of very *bright Parts*, and of
 “ very *good Principles* ; she was a Daugh-
 “ ter of the House of *Buchanan*. In the
 “ Progress of our Discourse, we came to
 “ talk of the famous Mr. *George Buchanan* ;
 “ I told her I had, not long before, read
 “ over *Famianus Strada’s* Book *de Bello Bel-*
 “ *gico*, and had found in it (I think *ad An.*
 “ 1586) an Account of Mr. *Buchanan’s*
 “ Confession, when on his Death-bed, That
 “ he had been most injurious, in Papers
 “ published by him, to *Mary* Queen of
 “ *Scots* ; wishing earnestly, That God
 “ would allow him Time and Strength, be-
 “ fore he died, to do her Justice. I added,
 “ That the Account was new to me (for I
 “ had not then seen *Camden’s Elisabeth*)
 “ and that I was afraid *Strada* was partial,
 “ having many other Things in his Book
 “ too like *Romance* ; and that therefore I
 “ was not forward to believe him in that
 “ Matter. The Lady forthwith desired me
 “ to take her Word for it, that it was a
 “ certain Truth ; for she remembered no-
 “ thing better, than that in her younger
 “ Years, she had oftner than once heard a
 “ very aged Man, called *David Buchanan*,
 “ who was *maintained* in her Father’s Fa-
 “ mily,

" mily, affirm, That he was present in Mr.
 " *Buchanan's* Bed-chamber, and an Ear-wit-
 " ness to that Confession when he made it:
 " This, so far as my Memory serves me,
 " is the Substance of what I learned of
 " that Lady at that Time. It made the
 " deeper Impression on me, when I reflect-
 " ed on the Time of Mr. *Buchanan's* Death,
 " which was in *September 1582*; at which
 " Time *David Buchanan* might have been
 " very capable to consider what Mr. *George*
 " said, tho' he had afterward lived after the
 " Year 1630 or 1636; and, about that
 " Time, the Lady was capable to have re-
 " ceived it from him."

Thus this old Wife's Tale is drest up by
 Mr. *Sage*, or the *Publisher* of his Life. Be-
 fore I examine it particularly, it may not
 be amiss to let the Reader a little into Mr.
Sage's Character. Mr. *John Sage* was a Mi-
 nister of the City of *Glasgow*, when the
 happy Revolution came about. " He was,
 " says Mr. *Anderson* (k), Master of several
 " good Qualifications, of a good Capacity
 " and great Application; but the Revolu-
 " tion had soured his Temper, which car-
 " ried him out often to transgress the Rules
 " of Religion, as well as Decency." From
 this

(k) *Anderson's* Defence against *Rhind*, Pag. 32.

this Character of him, 'tis easy to find he was a high flying Author, and of Consequence bore an implacable Hatred to the great *Buchanan*, which he sufficiently manifested in his Writings, especially in his *Introduction to Hawthornden's History*, which Mr. *Ruddiman* Midwif'd into the World. I shall not say Mr. *Ruddiman* had any Hand in the publishing this precious *Anecdote*; but its coming abroad three Years after Mr. *Sage's* Death (1), the Publisher concealing his Name, the Writer of his Life taking Notice of no such Thing, and Mr. *Sage* himself never hinting or publishing any such Story in any of his Works all his Life Time, not in his *Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, or the long *Preface* to it, nor in his *Introduction to Hawthornden*, where he *vamps* up, to use his own Expression, ill Nature enough against *Buchanan*; all this, I say, well considered, must needs create in every impartial Person, a strong Jealousy of foul Dealing in this Matter, to serve the Cause of the distress'd Church.

Now, making all the Allowance to Mr. *Sage's* *Veracity*, that can well be desired, it is most certain, that a Part of this Narration depends on his own frail Memory, which

(1) Anno 1714, that is, the Year before Mr. *Ruddiman* published *Buchanan's* Works.

which he had heard 28 Years before, and of the more frail Memory of a very old Woman, which she had heard, when very young, from *David Buchanan*, who was in extreme old Age when he told it to her, and she a very old Woman still remembered *David Buchanan's* Account of that Matter, from her Youth to her extreme old Age. The Memory, as every one must own, in these Circumstances is very subject to Wavering and Inconstancy. The great *Scaliger* in his advanced Years complained of his Memory, *accuso memoriam*, says he; the learned Mr. *Ruddiman* too, somewhere in his *Answer* to Mr. *Logan*, says, that his *Memory was the worse of the wearing*: But this old Wife had no such Complaint; and yet, who does not see, that this Tradition, thro' the Hands of an old Wife, is liable to these just Objections; and therefore deserves no Credit? Mr. *Sage* says, she was of the House of *Buchanan*, but he does not tell of what Branch of that House she was, nor whether it was by her Father or Mother's Side.

Again, Mr. *Sage*, to make this old Wife's Tale *probable*, says, she was a Lady of very *bright Parts*; no doubt of it, for he calls her an *antient Lady*; but *bright Parts* usually fail Ladies and Gentlemen too, when they
are

are antient. *She was a Lady*, continues he, of good Principles; that is not to be questioned, if she was for *Episcopacy*, and for the strict hereditary *indefeasible* Right of Kings. Who does not see, that she must have been a Lady of very bright Parts, and had all her Senses in great Perfection; for, upon Mr. Sage's relating what he had read in *Strada* about *Buchanan's* Confession, she instantly takes him up, and bids him take her Word for it that it was true, and opposes him for calling *Strada* a Romance Writer? The Ground of her Ladyship's Certainty was, that she remembered nothing better, than that, in her younger Years, she had oftner than once heard a very aged Man, called *David Buchanan*, affirm, That he was present in Mr. Buchanan's Bed-chamber, and an Ear-witness to the Confession when he made it. Here, I ask Mr. Ruddiman, is this the *David Buchanan* who published *Knox's* History at London in Folio, An. 1644, with a very long Preface, which shews his great Learning and Knowledge in Antiquity, and this Edition of *Knox* he reprinted at *Edinburgh* that very same Year in 4to? Is this the *David Buchanan* (m) who wrote *De Claris*

(m) Bp. Nicolson says, he also wrote *Edinburgi & Lethæ Descriptio*; and *Provincia Edinburgensia Descriptio*. Both which he saw. Scot. Hist. Lib. Pag. 21.

Clariss. Doctrina Scotis, a MS. formerly in Sir Robert Sibbald's Possession, from which Mr. Ruddiman, after Sir Robert favours us with a Quotation about George Buchanan in his Preface, and in his *Doctorem Virorum de Buchanano Testimonia*, and whom Mr. Ruddiman in one Place (n) says, he was Buchanan's *Gentilis ac Propinquus*, in another Place (o), when speaking of him, he says, *quem illi (Geo. nim. Buchanano) non solum nomine, sed genere conjunctum existimare liceat?* His saying so twice makes me think he had Mr. Sage's old Wife in View. Sir Robert Sibbald indeed (p), when speaking of him, calls him, *David Buchananus, ex eadem familia oriundus*, descended of the same Family: But in all his Writings I have read, I find he says no such Thing of himself; and therefore I am of Bishop Nicolson's Opinion (q), that he was only George Buchanan's NAME-SAKE; and he adds, in Way of Ridicule, "a Man very much after his own Heart, and as desirous as may be to cover all the Faults in him that are capable of Shelter." He was indeed a Person, as the Bishop speaks of R. Maule, Author of the Tract, *De antiquitate*

(n) Prefat. Pag. 12. (o) Buch. Vir. Pag. 11. (p) Comment. in Vir. Buch. Pag. 57. (q) Pag. 42.

late *gensis Scotorum*, of George Buchanan's Principles in Matters of Religion and Policy; but that he covered his Faults, that were capable of Shelter, we shall afterwards see was absolutely false. Is this the *David Buchanan*, I say, that Mr. Sage's old Wife speaks of? It is not said so by Mr. Sage; and yet I'm perswaded, Mr. Riddiman intended we should believe him to be the very same *David Buchanan*, who told that Story to Mr. Sage's old Wife, and so to connect it with Camden's HEARSAY. Mr. Sage says, he had this Relation from the Lady about 28 Years before October 17. 1709, when he wrote the Letter, if ever he wrote it, that is, in the Year 1681. Now, Mr. Sage states the Duration of *David Buchanan's* Life to the Year 1630, or, at most, to the Year 1636: But Mr. Sage must have been doating when he wrote that Letter, if it be true what the Writer of his Life says (r), that the Edition of *Knox's* History, which Mr. Sage made use of, was that published by *David Buchanan* at *Edinburgh* 1644. This the Publisher of Mr. Sage's Letter has not adverted to; and therefore it is a Proof of the Imposture of the whole Story. Nay further, Bishop *Nicolson* (s) acquaints us, that *David*

(r) Sage's Life, P. 20. (s) *Scot. Hist. Lib.* P. 27.

vid Buchanan was alive *An.* 1649 ; for there he gives us a Part of a critical Letter, writ to him from *Gordon of Straloch*, dated 8vo Kalend. Aug. A. D. 1649. But, let us examine a little into the Story from Mr. *Sage's* own Calculation. It was in the Year 1681 when Mr. *Sage* had the Conference with that Lady ; then she was an *antient Lady*. Now, let us suppose she was past her *Climacterick*, 63 Years of Age or so ; she was born then *An.* 1618 : Then, allowing her to be 12 Years of Age, when she saw *David Buchanan* at her Father's House, that is, in the Year 1630. So she has had a strong Memory, to relate distinctly what *David* said of Mr. *Buchanan's* Death-bed Confession and Repentance. Is not this a fine Foundation to build *George Buchanan's* Repentance upon, for the supposed Injuries he did to *Q. Mary* ? This Lady, as Mr. *Sage* informs us, told him, *That David Buchanan was MAINTAINED in her Father's Family*. This is added, no doubt, to support what she had said, that she had oftner than once heard *David Buchanan* affirm, that he was in *Buchanan's* Bed-chamber, and an Ear-witness to the Confession : But then it entirely discredits the whole Story, and is another convincing Proof of the Imposture. In the *first* Place, I wish this old

old Woman had told us who was her Father, and then we might have judged if he was able to *maintain* such an old Man about his House. In the *second* Place, *David Buchanan* was never reduced to such Poverty and Want, as to be obliged to any for his daily Bread. For, *thirdly*, in the Year 1644, that is 8 Years after 1636, which is the longest Duration assign'd to *David Buchanan's* Life by Mr. *Sage*, he publishes an Edition, as was said already, of *Knox's* History, at *London*, in Folio; and that he reprinted the same Year, at *Edinburgh*, in Quarto. He is generally believed to be the Author of the 5th Book of *Knox's* History, and of *Knox's* Life prefix'd to these Editions; and Author also of many Interpolations thrust into *Knox's* Four Books of his History, from which it is purged and cleared, in the accurate and excellent Edition of that truly great Man's History, printed at *Edinburgh* An. 1732 (1), from the original MS. in the Library of the College of *Glasgow*; and this is owing to the Industry and Care of the late Reverend and Learned Mr. *Matthew Crawford*, Professor of Church History in the College of *Edinburgh*.
Now,

(1) See the learned Mr. *Wodrow's* Letter to Bishop *Nicolson*, in the Appendix to his *Scot. Hist. Lib.* P. 139. and *Knox's* Life prefixed to his History, *Edinburgh* 1732, P. 46.

Now, from this it is plain, that it is false, that *David Buchanan* was reduced to such Poverty, as to be maintained in the Family of the Lady *Rafyth's* Father. But, 4thly, This is further evident from the critical Letter sent to *David Buchanan* by Sir *Robert Gordon* of *Straloch*, An. 1649. Would that haughty Man, and such he appears to me to have been, from what I have read of his Writings; would he, I say, keep up a Correspondence with such a poor beggarly Man, maintained out of Charity at another Man's Table, as he is represented by Mr. *Sage's* old Wife? And would Sir *Robert* devolve upon such a mean Man the finishing of the *Theatrum Scotiae*, for *Bleau's* Atlas, a Work that he himself had been engaged in, at the Request of the fore-mentioned great Undertaker of that General Body of *Geography*, first begun at the Expence of Sir *John Scot* of *Scotstarvet*, Director of the Chancery, which Bishop *Nicolson* (o) says he did? No, Sir *Robert*, to be sure, would not; and from thence we may most justly conclude, that what this old Wife narrated to Mr. *Sage*, was a downright Lie and Falshood. Again, 5thly, If *David Buchanan* was an Ear-witness to *George Buchanan's* Repentance on his Death-bed,

(o) Scot. Hist. Lib. P. 7.

bed, we cannot suppose him to be less than 20 Years of Age when *Buchanan* died, *September 28. 1582.* In the Year 1649, he would be Eighty seven Years of Age, and consequently incapable for the Work he was employed in by Sir *Robert Gordon*; and therefore it must be false, that he was an Ear-witness to *Buchanan's* Confession. 6thly, If *David Buchanan* had been present in *Buchanan's* Bed-chamber, when he emitted that Confession, or if ever he had heard of such a Thing, we may be very sure he would have transmitted it to Posterity, when he makes so very free with his *Cousin's* Character, if he was his *Cousin*, which I very much doubt of: For he says of him, *Erat austero supercilio, & toto corporis habitu (imo moribus hic noster) subagrestis (w).* Now, when Mr. *Ruddiman* (x) comes to repeat this Character of the great Man, whose Life he is describing, he leaves out this Part, *Imo moribus hic noster, subagrestis sc.* and inserts another, which I wish he had forbore, *Austero fuisse supercilio (quod & ipsius imagines adhuc præferunt.)*

As to the first Part of this Character, that *Buchanan* was a Man of an *austere* or reserved Gravity in his Looks, and somewhat

(w) Vide Doctorum de *Buchanano* Testimonia, apud *Ruddimannum*, P. 13. & 14. (x) *Buch. Vit.* P. 11.

what rustick or Stoical in his Dress; Mr. *Ruddiman* very discreetly excuses him afterwards for it, on account of his great Want of Health, and other Inconveniences of old Age, which use to fret the best of Men, and make them uneasy to their Friends and to themselves too. And as to his Dress, that may be owing to his being a Batchelor all his Life. I know very good and learned Men at this Day, to whom this Character may be apply'd, and yet they are deservedly esteemed as useful Members of Society. For otherwise it is most certain, that *Buchanan* was a most facetious and agreeable Man in Conversation, and that render'd him so very acceptable to the *French* Nation, that *Adr. Turnebus* says, *He does not think there was a polite Man in France, who was not of George Buchanan's Acquaintance.* His Picture seems to have been taken some short While before his Death, and therefore it must not only *ad hoc* but *in perpetuum* exhibite that Air and these Features of his Face, that were taken at first.

I do believe this other Part of *Buchanan's* Character, that he was *moribus subagrestis*, somewhat rustick or coarse in his Morals, was what Mr. *Ruddiman* did not think true; and it is indeed most certainly false: For
Sir

Sir *James Melvil*, his Adversary, says, "He was pleasant in Conversation, rehearsing at all Occasions Moralities short and instructive, whereof he had Abundance, inventing where he wanted: He was also, *religious* (y)." Nay, Mr. *Ruddiman* himself has given *Buchanan* as great and noble a Character, as perhaps has been given him by any Author whatsoever, which I shall here transcribe (z). "From the Time, says he, that *Buchanan* returned last to his native Country, he joined the Reformation; and not only his own Writings, but the Testimonies also of others who enjoyed his Conversation daily, declare, That he cultivated all the Virtues, and especially lived a religious Life." And then he repeats with Commendation what I have now quoted from Sir *James Melvil*. And in the same Page, Col. 2. he further says, "Even this is a Proof, that *Buchanan* gave himself to Piety and the sincere Worship of God, That, by a singular Example, he

(y) Sir *James Melvil*'s Memoirs, P. 250.

(z) *Buch. Vit.* P. 12. Col. 1. Ex quo autem in patriam postremo reversus, puriori religioni nomen dedit, cum virtutes omnes, atque imprimis pietatem coluisse, non modo ipse scripta, sed aliorum etiam, qui quotidiana ejus consuetudine fruebantur, testimonia declarant.

Ibid. Col. 2. Pietati vero, sinceroque Dei cultui studuisse, vel illud indicio est, quod singulari exemplo, synodi nationalis, quæ Edinburgi haberi coepta est 25 Junii, Anno 1567, Præses sive Moderator esset electus, tum collegii Leonardini Rector, nulloque sacri muneris auctoramento honestatus.

" he was chosen Moderator of the Gene-
 " ral Assembly which met at *Edinburgh*
 " 25th *June, An. 1567*, being then Prin-
 " cipal of *St. Leonards College*, and not
 " invested with the sacred Office." But in P.
 10. Col. 2. immediately preceeding, the same
 Mr. *Ruddiman* gives him a quite different
 and black Character. For there, speaking
 of *Buchanan's Admonition to the true Lords*,
 " In it, says Mr. Ruddiman †, he furiously
 " rages with an outrageous Boldness against
 " all who favoured the Exile Queen, espe-
 " cially against the *Hamiltons*; he endea-
 " vours, with all his Might, to disparage
 " and defame that most illustrious Family,
 " and that deserved so well of *Scotland*,
 " with so many Injuries, Reproaches and
 " Slanders, that we have Reason to be for-
 " ry for it, not so much for that Family's
 " Sake, as for *Buchanan's own Sake*." Mr.
Ruddiman can best explain how he came to
 hit upon such inconsistent Characters, and
 which visibly destroy one another. We now
 see how unjust the Bishop of *Carlisle* is to

Da-

† *Buch. Vit. P. 10. Col. 2.* Altero vero, cui titulus est, *An*
Admonition to the true Lords, in omnes qui Regina exuli fave-
 bant, præcipue *Hamiltonios*, immani audacia debacchatur,
 tot injuriis, conviciis, & probris; illustrissimæ & de re *Scotica*
 optime meritæ familiæ famam & existimationem dehone-
 stare ac proscindere adnititur, ut non illius magis quam *Bu-*
chanani ipsius causa dolendum sit.

David Buchanan, in saying he was as desirous as may be to cover all the Faults in George Buchanan that were capable of Shelter. Lastly, We shall show from the famous Mr. James Melvin's Diary, who visited Buchanan on his Death-bed; that this Story from Mr. Sage's Old Wife was really and truly *anilis fabula*, and as great a Romance as any Thing in Strada, or any other Romance Writer. The impartial Reader will now see, that, if Mr. Ruddiman had considered this Matter, as he ought to have done, he would not have been determined to believe a Falshood, to abuse the Memory of the great Man, whose Works he was employed to publish.

Let us next enquire, when Buchanan should have repented. Mr. Ruddiman (a) fairly owns, that he repented not in the End of the Year 1579, when he wrote his own Life; "Because this very Year, he had for
 " the first Time published his Dialogue *De
 " jure Regni apud Scotos*, in which Work
 " he defends and vindicates all that was
 " said and done by himself and his Party
 " against that most serene Princess, Queen
 " Mary. Besides, continues Mr. Ruddiman,
 " he had not as yet published his History;
 " which, had he truly repented then,
 E. " he

(a) *Buch. Vit.* P. 9.

“ he would either have suppress’d in perpetual
 “ Darknes, or, at least, would have
 “ purged it from that bitter slanderous Rail-
 “ ing, with which he inveighs against
 “ *Mary’s Reputation.*” It is observable,
 that if this *Dialogue* had contained such dis-
 obliging Things, or so unacceptable to the
 Court, as Mr. *Ruddiman* here alledges, *Bu-*
chanan would not have adventured the de-
 dicating of it to the King; at least, that it
 would not have been licens’d with his *Royal*
Privilege, and that not in his Minority,
 but probably soon after his Majesty had
 taken upon himself the Administration of
 the Government, which he did this very
 Year on the 8th of *March 1579*, as Mr.
Ruddiman (b) informs us from the *publick*
Records. Mr. *Ruddiman*, without taking
 Notice of what he here says, in another
 Work (c) since that, tells us, That King
James took upon himself the Government,
 the 15th of *February 1578.* *Nihil turpius,*
says Cicero, quam quod in scriptis oblivisceretur,
quid paulò ante posuisset. Tho’ this were not
 the Case, it ought to convince Mr. *Rud-*
diman however, that *Buchanan* deserved bet-
 ter Quarters than he met with from him,
 for such Escapes, some of which, were
 not

(b) In nota ad *Buch. Ep.* 28. P. 26. (c) *Series Regum*
Scotia chronologica, before *Anderson’s Diplomata*, P. 90.

not so gross as this. The Reader will observe, that the Year with us at that Time, and till *January 1. 1600*, commenced the 25th of *March*; so that there is 1 Year, and about 21 Days of Difference, betwixt his two Accounts of that Matter: But, leaving Mr. *Ruddiman* to adjust this his last Account with the publick Records, I go on. We have much better Authority, that *Buchanan* did not then repent, and that is from this great Man himself, in his Letter to Mr. *Daniel Rogers* (*d*) at *London*, wherein he allows him to publish his Dialogue *De Regno*, "so much the rather, says he, as it " was reported, that some in *Scotland* were " said to be designing a Confutation of it: " and if there be any in *England*, continues " he, of the same Resolution, as I doubt " not there may be, I could wish they " would do it while I'm alive, *cuperem ut " id me vivo facerent.*" This Letter is dated at *Edinburgh, November 9. 1579.* There is no Sign of Repentance here: Neither is it likely he repented all the while he was writing his History, and not till after the Publication of it, and this Mr. *Ruddiman* seems to allow. And thus we have *Buchanan* clear of that vile Aspersions, cast on his Memory, till within less than a

E 2

Month

(*d*) *Buch. Ep. 27, P. 25.*

Month of his Death: For Mr. *Ruddiman* (e) acquaints us, that *Buchanan* scarcely lived a whole Month after its Publication; and I shall demonstrate immediately, that he did not live the Half of that Time, if so much. In this short Period of Time, there could not be many Copies of *Buchanan's* History abroad, if any at all; but possibly indeed, the King, to whom it is dedicated, might have got a Copy of it (which yet I can scarce believe, as I shall shew afterwards) and he might be nettled with the tragical Accounts of his Mother: For, we find, many Years after this, when the great *Thuanus's* Son was introduced to him (f), the Reception he gave him was, "Is this the Pedant's Son, that miscalled
" my Mother?"

From this very Dedication, *Camden's* *Hearsay* is rendered highly improbable, nay, I think, absolutely false. It is dated IV. *Calend. Septemb.* that is, on the 29th *August* 1582, and *Buchanan* died 28th *September* following. Now, if he had retracted or repented of what he wrote against *Queen Mary*, the King's Mother, with what Confidence could he have address'd his History to the Son? This, I'm confident, will have
great

(e) *Buch. Vit.* P. 10. (f) See Dr. *Burnet* against *Varillas*.

great Weight with all candid and honest Men.

I am next to present the Reader with an incontestable Demonstration of the Falshood of *Camden's* Hearsay ; and that is from the *Diary* of Mr. *James Melvin*, a Minister of this Church at that Time, and Brother to the famous Mr. *Andrew Melvin* ; for which we are obliged to the late Reverend and Learned Mr. *Robert Wodrow* Minister at *Eastwood*, who was a curious Searcher into our Antiquities, and has left behind him many valuable and original Papers, among which this is one, and at present in the Possession of his Son, who has succeeded him in the sacred Office at that Church. From this *Diary*, is most faithfully taken the following most remarkable Passage, relating to the Subject we are now upon. Mr. *Melvin* says, " That he went with his " Brother *Andrew*, and *Thomas Buchanan* (g), " to visit Mr. *George*, in the Month of " *September*, Anno 1582 : That they went " to the Printing-house, and observed that " the Printer had come the Length of the " 17th Book of his History, where he " speaks

(g) Both these, as well as the former, were then Ministers of this Church, and all the Three are much mentioned in the Acts of Assembly, and by our Church-Historians in that Period.

“ speaks of the Burial of *David Rizzio* ;
 “ for which, without all Question, he was
 “ obnoxious to the Resentment of the
 “ King : That this might procure a Stop to
 “ the Work, if not a total Suppression of
 “ it. *Thomas Buchanan*, George’s Kinsman,
 “ represented the Risk he did run from
 “ the Wrath and Hatred of the King. To
 “ whom *George* replied, *Tell me, Man,*
 “ *whether I have written the Truth and Mat-*
 “ *ter of Fact.* *Thomas* answered, So I think.
 “ Then *George* said, I am not afraid of
 “ the Fury of the King and of his Cour-
 “ tiers ; pray for me ; let God order all
 “ Things, provided that my *Annals* be
 “ compleatly printed.”

From this *Diary*, it is evident, *first*, That
 when these three Clergymen visited *Bu-*
chanan on his Death-bed, in *September 1582*,
 the 17th Book of his History was just
 finishing that very Day ; and we may well
 suppose, that it would take up very near
 the rest of the Month, in finishing the other
 three remaining Books of his History ; so
 that *Buchanan* scarce outlived the Publica-
 tion of it. *2dly*, It is most evident from
 thence, that *George Buchanan*, who was a
 good religious Man, in the Opinion of Sir
James Melvil ; a devout, sincerely pious
 Man, in Mr. *Ruddiman*’s Opinion, upon
 his

his Death-bed, at a Time, when one would think, he would declare the Truth, maintains it was all Truth and Matter of Fact, what he related on Queen *Mary's* Reign; and we have Mr. *Thomas Buchanan's* Testimony saying it was so. Lastly, We see how anxious *Buchanan* was, that his *Annals* or *History* should be published to the World, completely; which sufficiently confutes *Robert Johnston's* impudent Assertion formerly mentioned. This Piece of valuable History, contained in this *Diary*, will not only, in the Opinion of every unprejudiced and impartial Person, carry off the vile Calumny and Aspersions cast upon *Buchanan's* Memory; but will even also convince Mr. *Ruddiman*, if he is sincerely disposed to receive the Truth, as, I hope, he is; and he must necessarily see, that this is better Authority than *Camden's* Hearsay, or Mr. *Sage's* *Anilis Fabula*. It seems very plain, that if *Buchanan* was tampered with by the King or his Courtiers, to retract what he writ concerning Queen *Mary*, it could not be when he was dying, nor in that Month of *September* when he died; nay, it behoved to be sometime before the 23d *August* that Year; because *Spotswood* (*h*) tells us, that the King's Person was surpris'd at *Ruthven* the

(*h*) Hist. P. 320.

the 23d *August* 1582; and he seems not to have been at *Edinburgh* till the Eighth of *October* thereafter; before which Time *Buchanan* was dead and buried. At this Surprize at *Ruthven*, Captain *Stuart* and *d'Aubigny* were removed from the Direction of the King and his Councils; and he was thereafter under the Direction of those who were friendly to *Buchanan*: And accordingly, I'm told, that Mr. *Wodrow*, in his MS. History of *Buchanan's* Life, alledges, *Buchanan's* History had the Royal Privilege; tho' *Arbuthnot's* Edition bears no such Thing in its Title-page. This we know for certain, that neither King nor Court offered any Indignity to *Buchanan* or his Works, till near two Years thereafter, when that pack'd Parliament met in the Year 1584, when his History and Dialogue were condemned, the last of which, at least, had been licensed by the King's Authority, which was a little Rub on his Majesty. I have great Reason, therefore, to think, that Sir *John Scot* of *Scotstarvet*, in his staggering *State of Scots Statesmen* (i), a MS. was imposed upon by the Tradition he narrates, "of *Buchanan's* being summoned, before he died, before the Privy Council, " for

(i) See the Quotation in Mr. *Ruddiman's* Edit. of *Buchanan's* Works, Testimon. P. 15.

were the Beginning of the Meanness of that Reign, and a Presage of the arbitrary and despotic Government that followed. I don't think, for the Reasons already given, that the King went to visit *Buchanan* on his Death-bed, and to tamper with him; but if he did, he justly merited from him the following Reprehension, as we have it in an antient *Greek Poet*,

—— Μεγά δ' ἀχθῶμαι, εἴ τῷ με τολμῆς
Ομμασί τοις ὀρθοῖς ποτιβλέπεῖν, ὃν πόχ' ἔοντα
Παῖδ' ἐτ, ἐγὼν ἐδιδάσκον. Ἰδ' Ἀχαιεὺς ἐς τὶ ποθέρεται.

—— Moleste admodum fero, si tu me audes
Oculis rectis inspicere, quem olim cum esses
Puer adhuc, ego docebam. En gratia quo recidit!

Bishop *Nicolson* (k) justly observes, that King *James*, “by his Way of Ruling afterwards, did not seem to be much tainted with his Tutor's Principles.” And he might have added, if he had pleased, that he instilled such Principles into his Son King *Charles I.* that proved his Ruin.

This Matter receives no small Weight from the Silence of *Buchanan's* Cotemporary, Sir *James Melvil*, who was by no Means friendly to him, being *diversarum partium*, and who exaggerates, in Mr. *Rudiman's* own Opinion, the Faults he lays to his Charge, I mean his *Stoicism* and *Credulity*.

lity in his old Days. The same may be said of *Winzet, Blackwood, Barclay*, and others of that *papistical* Crew, who, after *Buchanan's* Death, wrote against his Dialogue, and pretended to give a Confutation of it: But their Answers perished with themselves, and the Dialogue, like a strong Fortrefs, stands, as yet, impregnable. Mr. *Ruddiman* (1) tells us, he did not adventure the attacking this Fortrefs; *in causæ*, says he, *quod dicitur, arcem nunquam invadimus*; that is, he did not formally lay Siege to it; but as true it is, he has been nibbling at the sapping its Foundation, every where thro' his Notes on *Buchanan's* History. The *Congressus*, in *Gordon* of *Straloch's* Opinion at least, and others of his Stamp, might have appeared, not so very *impar*, the Fortrefs being built by one old Schoolmaster, and attempted to be pulled down by another. However, I own, he was so much the wiser, in not making his Approaches, but at a great Distance; for he might have got his Fingers burnt, or been stifled in the first Attack.

The Falshood also of *Camden's* Hearsay, is very much confirmed from Bishop *Spotswood's* Silence. Had there been any Truth in *Buchanan's* repenting on his Death-bed
before

(1) *Præfat.* Pag. 19.

before the King, of what he had writ against his Mother, *Spotswood*, who was then 16 Years of Age, and for most Part residing in the Neighbourhood of *Edinburgh*, I mean at *Calder*, where his Father was Minister and Superintendent of *Lothian*, and in whose Charge, as Minister, he was ordain'd the Year following (m); I say, had there been any Truth in that Matter, this active young Clergyman could not miss to have heard it; and considering how great a *Sycophant* he was thereafter to King *James*, he would as surely have told it in his History, where he gives *Buchanan's* Character, and speaks of his Death.

From all which, one may most justly conclude, that this Story of *Buchanan's* Repentance, is a gross Falshood, and a vile Calumny thrown on the Memory of that great Man. The *Architectus*, or Master-Builder of which, to speak in Mr. *Ruddiman's* Stile, is *Camden*, and the Retailers of it are Messieurs *Sage* and *Ruddiman*, without any Shame, or any just or reasonable Foundation.

Mr. *Ruddiman* is so far from repenting what he has said on this Head, that he has the Assurance to say, in his Answer to Mr. *Logan*,

(m) See Bishop *Spotswood's* Life, prefix'd to his History.

Logan (n), "That in his Opinion it is on
 " the charitable Side [the reporting that
 " *Buchanan* did repent] and if he did not
 " repent, as Mr. *Logan* would have it, he
 " has now a *heavier Account* to make: And
 " whether he did or not, *adds he*, I am very
 " sure he ought to have repented." I have
 at great Length proved that Story of *Bu-*
chanan's Repentance to be a great Falshood,
 and unjust to the Memory of that great
 Man; and therefore the flandering and re-
 proaching him in this malicious Manner,
 can never be on the *charitable Side*. *Charity*,
 says St. *Paul*, *thinketh no Evil, rejoiceth not*
in Iniquity, but rejoiceth in the Truth. And
 is not this Manner of speaking, a most
 horrid and unwarrantable calumniating the
 Memory of a Man, vastly superior to him-
 self in every Respect, without detracting
 from Mr. *Ruddiman's* real Worth and Merit,
 as a great Scholar, and the first Gramma-
 rian of this Age? *He has now*, says Mr.
Ruddiman, *the heavier Accounts to make*. Is
 this like a Christian? For, *Who art thou*
that judgest another Man's Servant? Judge not
before the Time. Has Q. *Mary* so very easy
 Accounts to make? And will she not, at
 the great Day, be on a Level with the
 meanest Peasant? It is, however, another
 of

of these many vile Reflections Mr. *Ruddiman* has *vampt* (o) up, first and last, against that truly great and good Man. Mr. *Ruddiman* farther says, *If Buchanan did not repent, he is sure he ought to have repented.* And I am of Opinion this is not quite so mannerly to the many in *Buchanan's* Time, and in every Period and Reign since, and to the many who at this Day believe, that what *Buchanan* wrote concerning *Q. Mary*, is, for most Part, Truth and Fact, notwithstanding all the Attempts made to varnish over and disguise her History. If *Buchanan* has *blacken'd* her Reputation, as these Writers assert, has Sir *James Melvil*, her great Favourite and Friend, *whiten'd* it in his *Memoirs*? Has Mr. *John Spotswood* Superintendent of *Lothian*, the Archbishop's Father, a very eminent Man, living in the Time, and at no great Distance from the Scene of Action; has he, I say, *whiten'd* it in his *pastoral Admonition* to all within his Diocese

(o) This is a Word in great Request with these High-fliers, *Sage* and *Keith*, when railing against *Buchanan*; the first uses it in his *Introduction* to *Hawthornden's* History; the other in his *History*, at the Foot of Pag. 326. "Mr. *Buchanan*, says "he, vamps up very pretty Flourishes against *Riccio*." A Phrase, I am persuaded, not otherwise to be found in any *English* Author, good or bad: Such is the Propriety in the Language of that Writer! Let that Gentleman compare what Sir *James Melvil*, and his good Prelate *Spotswood*, have *vampt* up against that most worthless Miscreant, and he'll find the *Flourishes* pretty much the same.

case (p)? It is blacker and worse than any Thing Buchanan has said of her. This Admonition is indeed very pithy, says Keith; MOST SPITEFUL says Ruddiman (q), and which nothing but his Ignorance of the true Matter of Fact, and the Madness of these Times can excuse. Mr. Keith here *serpit humi*, creeps on the Ground for once; whereas Mr. Ruddiman *caput inter nubila condit*, hides his Head among the Clouds; so high does he soar above the other; he stands at nothing. But it is well known, Mr. Spotswood was a Man of a fine Character, of great Esteem and Note in those Times, and had better Access to know the Truth, than any Man now living can pretend to. Does this worthy Man's Son, and Successor in Office, as Minister of Calder, thereafter Archbishop of Glasgow, and last of all of St. Andrews, and Chancellor of Scotland; Does he, I say, whiten Q. Mary's Reputation? "Does not he, says the late Reverend and Learned Mr. John Anderson (r), tell the Story of Signior Davie much after the same Way with Buchanan? Does not he tell of the horrid Abuse the King met with at Stirling, how he " was

(p) See this Letter of Admonition, in Keith's History, Pag. 591. (q) Answer, Pag. 203. (r) Defence against Rhind, Pag. 315.

" was neither admitted to be present at the
 " Baptism of his Son, nor suffered to come
 " to the Feast? How the foreign Ambassa-
 " dors were discharged to see or salute
 " him; and such of the Nobility, as vouch-
 " safed him a Visit, were frown'd upon by
 " the Court; and he at last dismiss'd with a
 " Doze of Poison in his Guts. Does he
 " not expressly tell, that the King was
 " murdered by *Bothwell* and the *Queen's*
 " *Domesticks*? Does not all the World know
 " that her Majesty afterward married the
 " Murderer, and that too upon a Divorce
 " from the Lady *Jean Gordon* his Wife, ob-
 " tain'd in the most scandalous Manner?
 " Does not *Spotswood* relate all these
 " Things?" Mr. *Ruddiman* will not say,
 That Archbishop *Spotswood* was one of the
wicked Reformers; neither can he say, That
 what he wrote about *Q. Mary*, was
thro' Ignorance of the true Matter of Fact.
 For we are told in his Life, that he " had
 " not only the Use of all the Registers,
 " both of Church and State in *Scotland*,
 " but of all Letters of State that could
 " any way concern the Work he was a-
 " bout." And certain it is, that, in most
 Things relating to this Period, he follows
Knox and *Buchanan*, for which Mr. *Keith*
 seems

seems very ill pleased with him. Queen Mary's Actions have been so very disagreeable and distasteful to Bishop *Spotswood*, that when K. *James* put him upon the writing of his History, he address'd the King in the following Manner, as we have it in his Life prefix'd to his History. "It is not
 " unknown to your Majesty (saith the Bishop, being willing enough to find an handsome Excuse) that your Majesty's Mother
 " being defamed by the bold Writings of a malicious Party, and the Credulities of
 " easy People (who, to avoid the Trouble of searching into them, use to swallow
 " such Reports as these without chewing) *bath not left a clear Name behind her.* And,
 " as, in mine own particular Judgment, I cannot join with them in those Scandals,
 " which they have with so *malicious a Falshood (e)* cast upon her; so your
 " Majesty must give me Leave to say, *That in all Things she did, I cannot approve her:*
 " And being of Necessity to speak of her in the Series of this History, what to do
 " therein, I know not." To whom the King reply'd, "*Speak the Truth, Man, and spare not.*" It is exceeding curious to hear this great Sycophant and Court Flatterer

G

(f) Here and before, the Bishop most unmercifully pelts his worthy Father, for his Admonition.

terer speaking to the King about his Mother, and telling him, *She had not left a clear Name behind her, and that in all Things he cannot approve her*: And when this is compared with the Account already given from his History of the Queen, in which he follows *Buchanan*, and differs very little from him, one cannot miss to observe the Bishop's *Inconsistency* with himself, when, in his Character of *Buchanan*, he says, "That all wise Men have disliked his Bitterness in writing of the Queen and Troubles of the Time." And as for the King's Answer, it is certain he afterwards chang'd his Mind, after he had been some Years in *England*, and was beginning to grasp at despotick and arbitrary Power. This is most evident from *Isaac Casaubon* and *Camden*, their Letters written in the King's Name, and by his Direction, on that Head, to the most illustrious President *Monf. de Thou*, and from his Answers to them, in that Collection of *Camden's* Letters, published by *Dr. Thomas Smith*, London 1691; one of which shall be insert in the *Appendix* to this Vindication, as giving great Light to the Affair we are now upon, and besides containing an Apology for himself for following *Buchanan* in what concerned *Q. Mary's* Reign.

Having

Having given the Accounts these eminent Men deliver, with respect to Q. *Mary* and her Management, in Confirmation of *Buchanan's* History, and who were also his Contemporaries ; for Bishop *Spotswood* may be justly reckoned such, as being 16 Years of Age when *Buchanan* died. I proceed next to present the Reader with the Relation of two *Roman* Catholicks on that Head, and who lived also at that Time, which I persuade myself will be the more acceptable, as they are rare and curious.

The first is, *Giovani Batista Adriani*, *Gentilhomo Fiorentino*, his History of his own Time, writ in *Italian*, printed Anno 1583 in Fol. and thereafter at *Venice* in 1587, 2 Vols. 4to, impresso Bern. *Quinti*, and published by the Author's Son *Marcello Adriani*. This curious Piece contains the History of Affairs in *Europe*, but especially in *Italy*, from the 1536 to the 1573. The Author, after having slightly touched at the Confusions in *Scotland*, under Q. *Mary*, discharges a deal of Rancour and Fury against the Protestants, as the Enemies of Religion ; and with Respect to Lord *Darnley's* Death, delivers himself thus, Tom. 2. p. 1353 *ad An.* 1566, according as it is translated. " After this, many were the

" Events that befel that Kingdom, her

“ (Queen *Mary's*) Husband not long after
 “ was found murdered together with his
 “ Page, nor was it well known by whom;
 “ there was however a strong Opinion,
 “ that it was done with her Consent, she
 “ having afterwards married one of the
 “ Lords of her own Kingdom, the very
 “ Person who was esteemed the Author of
 “ her first Husband's Murder; upon which
 “ she incurred an universal Odium, and
 “ was kept by her Adversaries in a close
 “ Prison, well guarded, and quite surroun-
 “ ded with Water; from which Place
 “ afterwards, by the Assistance of a single
 “ Page, having found Means to come at
 “ the Keys of the Prison, she went aboard
 “ a small Boat, and fled towards the Bor-
 “ ders of *England*, perhaps with a Design
 “ to pass over from thence into *France*,
 “ where Queen *Elisabeth* stopt her, and
 “ kept her there for some Time in courte-
 “ ous Prison, nor was she ever able to
 “ rescue herself from it.” This whole Pa-
 “ ragraph is extracted from the MS. An-
 swers to Mr. *Ruddiman's* Preface to *Bucha-*
man's Works, which I had by the Favour
 of the Reverend and Learned Clergyman,
 in whose Custody that Work at present is.

The next is *Ruggerius Tritonius*, Abbot
 of *Pignerol*, Secretary to *Vincentius Laureus*,
 Car-

Cardinal *de Monte Regali*, who was sent Nuncio from Pope *Pius V.* to Queen *Mary*, to assist her with his Counsel in the Extirpation of Heresy, and was waiting in *Flanders* for Orders from the Queen to come over into *Scotland*, at the Time when the King was murdered, and who kept an exact Correspondence with the *Roman Catholics* here in *Scotland*. This Author so very well qualified, not only from the said Correspondence, but also from the Cardinal's *Adversaria*, in the Life of the said Cardinal, printed at *Bononia* in 4to, apud *Heredes Johannis Rossii* cio. 12. 1599. *Superiorum permissu*, gives the same Account of *Darnley's* Murder, and of the *Queen's* Marriage with *Bothwell* his Murderer, as *Buchanan* does, which greatly establishes that celebrated Author's Account of that Matter. See Bishop *Burnet's* History of the Reformation, Vol. III. Appendix; and besides, the Abbot adds, from Pag. 19,—31, as quoted by the late learned Mr. *Anderson*, in his Defence against *Rhind*, Pag. 316, “That when the Nobility told her Majesty, that they had taken up Arms for bringing *Bothwell* to Punishment for murdering the King, and for the Violence done herself by him: Her Majesty justified *Bothwell*, and told them

"them he had done nothing without her
"Consent."

As this Testimony is a strong Confirmation of *Buchanan's* Narration; so it is a Commentary upon, and Confirmation of what Sir *James Melvil* says in his *Memoirs* (t), that when the *Queen, Huntly* and *himself*, were surpris'd and taken by *Bothwell* and his Friends, betwixt *Edinburgh* and *Linlithgow*, Captain *Blackater* alledged to Sir *James*, that it was with the *Queen's* own Consent. I very well know, that Mr. *Ruddiman* in his Preface to *Buchanan's* Works (u), strains hard to elude this Testimony of the Abbot of *Pignerol*, or rather of Cardinal *Laurens*, by the most pitiful shuffling Evasions, that ever any Man used. He begins with a Sneer at Bishop *Burnet*, for looking upon this Testimony as an *Achillean* Argument, as he is pleas'd to call it, in Confirmation of *Buchanan's* Narration. Why, so it is, as is also the other, and not to be eluded so easily, as Mr. *Ruddiman* apprehends. They are Testimonies from Adversaries, strong Catholics, and rather inclined to be on the *Queen's* Side, if they had not been strongly influenced by the Force of Truth. To satisfy the Reader's Curiosity, I shall give him one of Mr. *Ruddiman's* Objections to this

(t) Pag. 158. (u) Pag. 18.

this Testimony, from which he may judge of the rest. He says, " If the Abbot's Relation is taken from the Cardinal's Papers, the Cardinal may be thought to be enraged and provok'd on Account of the Stops and Delays he got to accomplish his Legation." For Answer: The Cardinal of himself stopt at *Brussels*, to wait for a favourable Opportunity to come over to *Scotland* to execute his Commission; but he very well knew of the Queen's good Intentions, she being bred up from her Infancy in the *Roman* Communion, and all along very much addicted to that Superstition; and therefore, he had no Reason to blame her for the Stops he met with. They were, on the contrary, owing to the great Progress of the *Reformation*, which the Queen herself, not even, with all the Assistance she had from *France* and *Rome*, was able to crush.

I proceed now to PART II.

PART

this Testimony, from which he may judge
of the rest. He says, "If the Absconder
is taken is taken from the Cardinal's hands,
the Cardinal may be thought to be an-
"ticipated and provoked on Account of the
"Stop and Delay, longer to accomplish
"his Design." For Answer: The Car-
dinal of himself first at Bury's, to wait
for a favourable Opportunity to come over
to Scotland to execute his Commission; but
he very well knew of the Queen's good
intentions, the being bred up from her in-
fancy in the Roman Communion, and all
along very much addicted to that Supersti-
tion; and therefore, he had no Reason to
blame her for the Stop he met with. They
were, on the contrary, owing to the great
Protrials of the Religion, which the
Queen herself, not even, with all the Af-
fluence she had from France and Rome, was
able to crain.

PART II.

PART I.



PART II.

Containing a Vindication of Buchanan, from the horrible Ingratitude he is charged with to Queen Mary; in extolling her so high, in his Dedication of his Paraphrase of the Psalms, and thereafter writing so bitterly against her, in the Detection and History.

— Te nostra, Vare, Myricæ,
Te nemus omne canet. Nec Phœbo gratior ulla est,
Quam sibi quæ Vari præscripsit pagina nomen. Vire.

THE Persons who accuse Buchanan of this Ingratitude are, Robert Jonston in his *Hist. rerum Britannicarum*, Mr. Innes of the Sorbon, and especially Mr. Ruddiman in his Notes on Buchanan's Life, and lately in his truly excellent *Vindication* of the *Paraphrase* against Mr. Benson. Our high flying Writers are especially

cially prejudiced against some Men, who have made a noble Stand in Defence of the Liberty of their Country, and for the just Rights and Privileges of it. Their Passion is in a remarkable Manner to be seen against the Earl of *Murray*, *Buchanan*, *Knox*, and other great Men at the Time of our *Reformation* from *Popery*; for when they are once mentioned, if *Queen Mary* be but in the least concerned, they then lose Temper quite, and are enraged not only *supra bonum atque honestum*, but really they observe no Bounds almost at all, even when they have little or no Foundation for their Assertions. This is very much to be seen in the present Case; I mean, in the *Ingratitude* they charge *Buchanan* with. *Buchanan's* Ingratitude, according to these Authors, is founded on *Queen Mary's* Munificence to him, which he experienced, in many other Things, but in this especially (a), That she made choice of him alone for Preceptor to her Son, and that before he was born. Mr. *Ruddiman* (b) says, “ That *Buchanan* was sent for from *France*, “ towards the End of the Year 1565, by “ *Queen Mary*, who then perceived herself with Child, to have the Care of the “ Education of her Child to be born; for “ the provident Queen, who herself was “ in-

(a) *Vit. Buch.* Pag. 9. Col. 2. (b) *Ibid* Pag. 8. Col. 2.

“ instructed in the liberal Arts, and that,
 “ as some think, by *Buchanan's* Assistance,
 “ seems even then to have fixt upon him,
 “ by far the most learned of all her Sub-
 “ jects, for Preceptor to her Son, if per-
 “ haps she should bring forth one.” In Pag.
 9th, which I first quoted, he says, “ That
 “ *Buchanan* being recalled from *France* by
 “ the Queen, as it would appear towards
 “ the End of 1565. The next Year he
 “ was appointed by her one of the Profes-
 “ sors, or rather *Principal*, of *St. Leonards*
 “ College in *St. Andrews*.” In his Vindi-
 cation of *Buchanan's* Paraphrase, Pag. 370.
 “ And I am sorry to add, says he, that the
 “ barbarous Treatment she (the Queen) met
 “ with from this same *Buchanan* (when he
 “ changed his Note soon after) and her
 “ other rebellious Subjects, gave her but
 “ too much Occasion to read that Book
 “ (the Psalms) more than any other.”
 “ *Buchanan*, says *Jonston*, bitterly upbraids
 “ Queen *Mary* with the most abominable
 “ Things, not remembring the Poems he
 “ had writ a little before, to the Memory
 “ of her Virtue.” Now, this is the Sum
 of the Charge against *Buchanan* for Ingrat-
 itude to Queen *Mary*. As to which in ge-
 neral, the learned Mr. *Hunter*, present Pro-
 fessor of *Greek* in the College of *Edinburgh*,
 in

in a Note on that famous *Epigram*, has given this most satisfying Answer. " If Buchanan, says he, afterwards wrote any Thing harsher against her, to be sure he thought he afterwards found Reason for it; nor ought this very great Encomium on the Queen by the *Poet*, supported by true Opinion, hinder him as an *Historian* from relating what he afterwards thought proper." Nay, Mr. *Ruddiman* himself seems to think so too. " But to leave this, says he (c), which I must own lies heavy upon our Author's Memory as an *Historian*, tho' his Character as a *Poet* is not in the least affected by it." What Mr. *Hunter* has said, and what Mr. *Ruddiman* himself here owns, vindicate *Buchanan* as a *Poet*, and for changing his Note afterwards as an *Historian*, he has been pretty much justified already by his Contemporary Writers, by the learned Mr. *Anderson* in his valuable Collections, and will be more fully so, when the learned *Answers* to Mr. *Ruddiman's* Preface and Notes on *Buchanan* shall be published. Mr. *Ruddiman* has very artfully laid out *Buchanan's* Ingratitude to Queen *Mary*, that, if what he says were true, it could not fail to place him

(c) Vindication, Pag. 371,

him in a very disadvantageous Light; but the Reader will find from a particular Examination of it, that there is not one Word of Truth in it from first to last.

When *Buchanan* returned into his native Country, after his long Peregrination or *Exile*, as he calls it, is not easy to determine. Some very great Men affirm, it was in the Year 1560 or thereabout. Mr. *Ruddiman*, on the contrary, maintains he did not return till the Year 1563. Each of them have very probable Conjectures on their Side. I incline to think he returned with his Pupil, the *Lord James*, Prior of *St. Andrews*, in May 1561, and that for several Years thereafter, he lived in his House there. This much is most certain, that he was a Member of the *General Assembly* of this Church, which met at *Edinburgh* the 25th *December* 1563, when they appoint the *Earl Marshall*, *Lord Ruthven*, *Lord Secretary*, the *Commendaire of Kilwinning*, the *Bishop of Orkney*, the *Clerk of Register*, the *Justice-clerk*, Mr. *Henry Balnaves*, *David Forrest* and Mr. *George Buchanan*, to revise the Book of Discipline, and report their Judgments in Writing to the next Assembly. This I have seen in an old Copy of the first General Assemblies of this Church, purchased lately at the Sale of
the

the *Harleian* Library ; and the same may be also seen in *Keith's History*, Pag. 529. Now, it is not probable he would have been a Member of that Assembly, if he had not been residing for some considerable Time in *Scotland* before that. However, it is agreed on all Hands, that Queen *Mary* returned to *Scotland*, in *August* 1561, on the 19th Day according to *Knox*, whom Mr. *Keith* seems to prefer to all our other Historians, even to Bishop *Lesly*, who came over with the Queen. *Buchanan's* Epigram to Queen *Mary*, seems to have been writ not long after her Arrival ; when the greatest Joy was exprest upon seeing their Sovereign, a young Widow Lady, Nineteen Years of Age, endued with the greatest Accomplishments both of Body and Mind, safely arrived, when it was believed, there was an *English* Fleet out at Sea to intercept her ; and above all, they rejoiced to see her delivered from the Clutches of the Cardinal of *Lorain* her Uncle ; and on that Account, they wish'd and hoped she would not be so violent an Enemy to the *Reformation*, established by Law the preceeding Year. Sir *James Melvil*, Mem. Pag. 61, tells us, that she was advised by M. *Martigues*, *la Brosse*, *D'Ofel*, and others of her Friends, who had lately returned to *France* from *Scotland*, to temporize,

temporize, and to repose most upon those of the reformed Religion. Accordingly, within a few Days after her Arrival, she issued out a Proclamation, "That nane tak upon Hand, privatly or oppinly, to maik any Alteration or Innovation of the *Stait of Religion*, or attempt any Thing agains the same, quhilk her Majesty fand *publicklye and universallie* *STANDING* at hir Majesties Arryval in this her Realme, under the Pane of Deyth (d)." To the same Purpose she emits another Proclamation, the last Day of May 1562. In such a Situation of Affairs, and when there were such great Hopes and Expectations, the Queen was a very proper Person, to whom *Buchanan* should dedicate his immortal *Paraphrase*. And accordingly, not many Months after this last Proclamation, we are informed by the famous Printer, *Harry Stephens*, that he had *Buchanan's* *Paraphrase* of the Psalms in his Hands, which he was immediately to publish; tho' he did not publish it for three Years thereafter; for

(d) See *Knox* and *Keith's* Hist. The Reader may observe, that the Queen does not here treat the *Parliament* 1560, or the *Reformation*, then establish'd, in such a vilifying and scandalous Manner, as does Mr. *Keith*, who calls it the *pretended Parliament*, and the *Reformation*, the *new Religion*, and yet he pretends himself to be a Minister of the new Religion. If he would throw of the Mask, there would be nothing in it.

for which various Reasons are assigned. This he tells us, in the *Preface* to the *Liber Psalmorum cum Catholica Expositione Ecclesiastica*, which he publishes, *Anno 1562*. Now, it is worth while to observe, that *Buchanan's Paraphrase* was in *Harry Stephen's* Custody more than 2 Years before that infamous Wretch, *Seignior Davie Rizio*, the *Italian Fidler*, was so powerful at Court, and the Queen's special Favourite, more than 3 Years before the King, the Queen's Husband, was murdered by *Bothwell* and the Queen's Domesticks; and about 3 Years and a Half before the Queen's scandalous Marriage with her Husband's Murderer *Bothwell*, which *Buchanan*, in Imitation of an antient Poet in *Cicero*, calls her *innuptas nuptias*, an *unlucky* or *ill made Match*. These are the three grand Stains upon her Reputation, which her greatest Admirers can never clear her of.

Mr. Ruddiman says, that *Buchanan* changed his *Note* soon after, that is, soon after he wrote the *Epigram*; and I suppose he means, when he wrote the *Detection*. As to which Book, *Mr. Ruddiman* in his *Preface* (e) tells us, that it was wrote in the same Year with the Dialogue *de jure Regni*, that is, according to him (f), *Anno 1569*, and that

(e) Pag. 19. (f) Pref. Pag. 16.

that it was published *Anno* 1571. But Mr. *Ruddiman*, in his Continuation of *Buchanan's* Life, Pag. 10. inconsistently indeed with himself, says the *Detection* was wrote by him *Anno* 1568, when the Conference at *York* was appointed by Queen *Elisabeth*, and that it was wrote by *Murray's* Orders. See also his Note on Hist. Lib. XIX. Pag. 461. Now, from this it appears, it was 6 Years at least after he wrote the *Epigram*, which was not so very soon after. Both Bishop *Nicolson* (g) and Mr. *Ruddiman* seem to think, that *Buchanan* wrote the *Detection* in *Latin* first, and the Bishop expressly says, that the same was afterwards published in the *Scotch* Language: But from Mr. *Anderson's* Collections, it rather seems evident, that *Buchanan* wrote it in the old *Scots* Language, and that it was printed at *St. Andrews*, *Anno* 1571, by *Robert Lekpre-
vick*, not in 1572, as Sir *Robert Sibbald* and the *Bishop* think, in the black Character, and soon thereafter it was reprinted in *Eng-
land*, in the same black Character, but fa-
shioned according to the Idiom of the then *English* Language, but not so correctly done; and being in the same Character with the first Edition, has made many think this *second* was the same with the *first*

I
Edition

(g) Scot. Hist. Lib. Pag. 57.

Edition of it ; and from this second Edition, the *French* Version, very probably, was made, but with some Additions, and from that the *Latin* Copy of the Detection, which is not *Buchanan's*, which any Body, that has but a tolerable Knowledge of the *Latin*, must see has nothing of the Purity and Elegance of *Buchanan's* Diction, there being besides many Gallicisms in it : And this possibly may serve as a Key to the grand Performance we are promised on this Head by Mr. *Ruddiman's* Friend. This Affair, and many others relating to *Buchanan's* Writings and Reputation, will, I hope, be soon communicated to the Publick. Mean while, I cannot but observe, that it is false what Mr. *Ruddiman* here asserts, That *Buchanan* wrote the *Detection* by *Murray's* Orders. Our learned Antiquary, Mr. *Anderson*, in his Collections, Vol. II. Pag. 260, gives the Copy of a Letter from a Gentleman at that Time, by which we are informed, that the Detection was writ before the Regent set out on his Journey for *York*, not by *Murray's* Orders, but from Instructions *Buchanan* received from the Lords of the *Privy Council*, at a Conference they had, which *Buchanan* was directed by them to put in Order, that they reviewed it thereafter, and approved of it.

I come next to consider what Mr. *Ruddiman* advances to found *Buchanan's* Ingratitude to *Queen Mary*,

In the *first* Place he says, That *Buchanan* experienced *Queen Mary's* Bounty in many Things. In many Things ; Pray what were these ? He condescends only on two Instances, her sending for him from *France* towards the End of 1565, when she found herself with Child, to be Preceptor to her Son, if she bore one ; and the Year thereafter appointing him *Principal* of *St. Leonard's* College. Now, these Instances are not only highly incredible, but also false, as we shall see presently ; nay Mr. *Ruddiman* himself owns, with respect to the first Instance, that he has no *good Authority* for it. He is therefore here publicly challenged to be more particular ; it is undoubtedly barbarous and cruel to call a Man ungrateful in such a general Manner, especially when he has no Voucher for it.

As to the *first* Instance. the *Queen's* sending for him from *France* in the End of the 1565, when she found herself with Child, to be Preceptor to her Son, if she bore one ; this Instance, I say, is highly incredible on several Accounts. In the *first* Place, *Queen Mary* was little more than three Months gone with Child at that Time ; for King

James was born *June 19. 1566*; and few, even the greatest Princesses, hardly ever publish their Pregnancy so very soon. Besides, she did not know whether she was with Child of a Boy or a Girl, or whether she was to bear a living or dead Child? Would she then, or any Woman of ordinary Prudence, in such an Uncertainty, invite home any Man to be Preceptor to her Child, little more than three Months in her Belly, and besides, he could not be under his Care for some Years thereafter? Any Man that can swallow this, may swallow the greatest Absurdity with Ease. In the *second Place*, *Q. Mary* was bred up a zealous *Papist*, educated in all the Fooleries and Superstition of the Church of *Rome*: Is it credible then, that she would invite home *Buchanan*, a no less zealous Protestant, and who but 2 Years before was a Member of the *General Assembly*, to be a Preceptor to her Son? No, it is not credible. She would rather, to be sure, have chosen one of her own Religion, who might train up her Son a *Catholick*, in hopes he might extirpate *Heresy* out of the Kingdom, and re-unite it again to the Bosom of the Church. Mr. *Ruddiman* seems to have been sensible of this Absurdity, and therefore he adds (*h*), “Tho’ there be no good
“ Au-

(*h*) Vit. Buch. P. 8. Col. 2.

" Authority for these Things [nay, there
 " is none at all] yet many Things seem to
 " confirm them; especially this, that other-
 " wise we shall find no Sense in *Lucas Fru-*
 " *terius's* Letter to *Buchanan*." Now this
 Letter has no other Date, than that it was
 writ Kal. *Feb.* and contains some obscure
 Verses, of which he can find no Meaning
 himself that can be depended on, and
 which he has handsomely enough dres'd up
 to render *Buchanan's* Ingratitude probable.
 He alledges this Letter must be writ on the
First of *February* 1566, and before the
 Summer of that Year, because *Fruterius*
 then died. No, says *Burman*, that can't
 be, because *Fruterius* died in the Month of
March that Year, and he gueffes it was writ in
February 1565. It is groping in the dark
 in both, and it is hard to rate a Man for In-
 gratitude upon such Guefs-work. Besides,
 we don't at all find, that *Buchanan* resorted
 much to *Q. Mary's* Court either before or
 after her Marriage with Lord *Darnly*: And
 this alone renders the whole of *Fruterius's*
 obscure Verses an absolute Joke.

It is most evident from the *Record* of
 the *Privy Council* of *Scotland*, which *Mr.*
Ruddiman gives us (i), that *Buchanan* was
 promoted to the Honour of being the King's
 Pre-

(i) Vit. *Buch.* P. 9. & 10.

Preceptor, not by the Queen, for then she had no Power or Authority, but by the Lords of Secret Council, and others of the Nobility and Estates, convened for taking Order in the Affairs of this Commonwealth, among other Things being careful of the King's Majesty's Preservation and good Education, as the Preamble of that Record bears, in the Year 1569, and that after the Earl of Murray was basely murder'd at *Linlithgow*, as we shall see: And therefore a Correction is necessary to the last Sentence of *Buchanan's Life*. "In
 " presentia, *says he*, septuagesimum quar-
 " tum annum agens, apud Jacobum Sex-
 " tum Scotorum regem, cui erudiendo erat
 " præfectus Anno millesimo quingentesimo
 " sexagesimo quinto, senectutis suæ malis
 " fractus, portum exoptans agit." Here, thro' the Oversight of *Buchanan's Amanuensis*, or the Printer's Carelessness, it has obtained thro' all the Editions of *Buchanan's Life*, that he was appointed Preceptor to the King in the Year 1565, which was impossible, as Mr. *Ruddiman* justly observes, because the King was not born that Year, and, as I shewed before, the Queen was little more than three Months gone with Child; and therefore Mr. *Ruddiman's* Correction, That, instead of *quinto*, it should be

be *hono*, is most reasonable, and so it ought to be amended. And by the first Part of this Sentence, we find, that *Buchanan* had finished the Writing of his Life, before the *First of February 1580*, for then he was 74 Years out.

We come next to consider the *second Instance* of *Buchanan's* Ingratitude to *Queen Mary*, condescended upon by *Mr. Ruddiman*, and that is, that in the Year 1566, after he had come over from *France* upon her Invitation, she appointed him *Principal* of *St. Leonard's College* at *St. Andrews*. In the *first Place*, I ask *Mr. Ruddiman*, upon what Authority he so confidently asserts, That the *Queen* sent for *Buchanan* from *France*? He has none, and I have already shown, that it is highly incredible; that she should have sent for him. It is a meer Dream and fanciful Imagination in *Mr. Ruddiman*, which by often repeating, he has brought himself at last fully to believe for a Truth. In the *second Place*, the presenting of *Buchanan* to be *Principal* of *St. Leonard's College*, was not in her Majesty's Gift; the Right of Presentation to that Office, belonged to the *Earl of Murray*, as *Prior* of *St. Andrews*, and who possessed the Rights and Revenues belonging to that *Priory*.

Priory till his Death, and by him it was,
 and not by the Queen, that *Buchanan* was
 presented to the Office of *Principal* there.
 This is most evident from the *Record* of the
Privy Council, which Mr. *Ruddiman* himself
 favours us with, when *Buchanan* was chosen
 by them Preceptor to the King, wherein
 we have the following numerical Words:
 “ And albeit the Presentation, Nomination
 “ and Admission of the Master of the said
 “ College (St. *Leonard's* mentioned imme-
 “ diately before) pertained of old to the
 “ *Prior* of St. *Andrews*, yet the same
 “ Right and Patronage presently appertains
 “ to our Sovereign Lord, as well by the
 “ Laws of the Realm, as because the *Priory*
 “ of St. *Andrews* presently vaiks destitute
 “ of a *Prior* or *Commendatar*.” I am sorry,
 on Mr. *Ruddiman's* Account, to say, that if
 he had not been wilfully blinded and preju-
 diced against *Buchanan*, this should have sa-
 tisfied him, that it was a downright Fal-
 shood, that the Queen presented *Buchanan*,
 or appointed him *Principal* of that College.
 Further, it is most evident from this *Re-
 cord* of the *Privy Council*, that the appoin-
 ting *Buchanan* to be the King's Preceptor,
 was posterior to the Earl of *Murray's* Death,
 which happened on the 23d Day of *January*
 1569, that is, according to our Computa-
 tion

tion now, *January 23. 1570*, because it is here said, that the *Priory of St. Andrews* presently *vaiks* destitute of a Prior or Comendatar. This *Record of the Privy Council*, as given by *Mr. Ruddiman*, is imperfect, ending abruptly, and wants a Date: If it is really so, there is no Help for it, but if it has a Date, I can't think he has acted fair with the Publick, in not giving it. It was without Doubt, at the first Meeting of the Privy Council and Nobility after the *Regent's* Death. This Observation likewise confutes another Mistake that *Mr. Ruddiman* has fallen into with respect to *Mr. Peter Young*, of whom he says (*k*), that in the same Year 1569, he was given as a Colleague to *Buchanan* for the Direction of the King's Studies by *Murray* the Regent. It is plain *Mr. Young* was associated to *Buchanan*, not by *Murray* the Regent, because he was dead, but by the *Privy Council* afterwards, seeing he is not mentioned in this Record.

From what has been said, I persuade myself, the impartial Reader is convinced, that I have fully cleared the great *Buchanan* from the *Ingratitude* he is charged with to *Queen Mary* by these Authors, which was what was undertaken to be done.

K

APPEN-

(*k*) *Vit. Buch. Pag. 10. Col. 1.*



APPENDIX.



SAAC CASAUBON'S Letter, which Mr. *Ruddiman* gives his Reader, in the Preface (1) to his Edition of *Buchanan's Works*, was writ by that learned Man, when he was kept by King *James*, under Pension, and employed as his Mercenary Hireling, in writing that and several other Letters to the illustrious President, *Monf. de Thou*, with Design to bias and prejudice that great Man and noble Historian, when writing the History of *Mary Queen of Scots*. For some Time before *Casaubon* came over to *England*, upon Invitation from the King, he was in a very fluctuating Way with respect to Religion, and making great Advances towards *Popery*. This is most evident from a Letter *Anno 1610* from *Petrus Molinaeus*,

(1) Pag. 12.

a very famous Man of the Reformed Church of *France*, to *Dr. Montague* Bishop of *Bath*, which is published by *Paulus Colomesius*, Curator of the Library at *Lambeth*. After *Casaubon* came to *England*, he became a Mercenary Sycophant and Tool to King *James*. Let us hear *Casaubon* himself on this Head, in his Letter to the same illustrious President, dated at *London*, *pridie Kal. Jan.* 1611 (*m*), about 2 Months, before he writes the Letter *Mr. Ruddiman* gives us. “*Hic, says he, omnis mea industria, omnes*”
 “*vigiliæ in eo solo occupantur, ut regis*”
 “*voluntati satisfaciamus.* And then he adds,
 “*Quum igitur maximi hujus regis mens*”
 “*tota in hodiernis de religione controver-*”
 “*siis occupetur, nos quoque τὰς ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ*”
 “*in iisdem studiis esse oportet, easdem*”
 “*curas suscipere.*” That is, all my Thoughtfulness, all my Night Studies are employed here in this one Thing, how I may satisfy the King’s Will.—Since this mighty King’s Thoughts are employed in the present Controversies about Religion, all of us who are about his Majesty must be taken up in the same Studies, and have the same Cares. Possibly *Casaubon* might be the
 King’s

(*m*) *Vid. Casauboni Epist. curante Jo. Georgio Grævio, Magdeburgi, Anno 1656, N°. 604, Pag. 683.* I don’t find the Letter *Mr. Ruddiman* gives us in this Edition, it must be in some other.

King's *Amanuensis*, in his controversial Disputes, with the learned Men of the Church of *Rome* at that Time; whether he was or not, we find him very complaisant to the King, who, about this Time too, was mightily intent upon altering the Form of Church Government, established in *Scotland* after the *Reformation*, and introducing *Episcopacy*. For *Casaubon*, from a *Geneva* or *Hugonet Presbyterian*, became all at once in Raptures with the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of *England*. We see this from his *Diary*, published by his Son, *Meric Casaubon*. At this Time, *Casaubon* much depended upon the King's Bounty and Munificence: He gave him two *Prebends*, one at *Canterbury*, and the other at *Westminster*, with a Salary of 2000 *French Livres* (n). We need not wonder then, that in such a Situation, he wrote such a Letter, full of most unjust and ill-natured Reflections against *Buchanan's History* and *Dialogue de Regno*. And after all, what he says, is founded on what he heard from the King, and those he calls *Integerrimi Viri*, most impartial Men, whom he does not particularly name, but in general that they were such; tho' it is as probable they were some Court

(n) See the General Dictionary, Historical and Critical, Lond. 1736, Art. *Casaubon*.

Court Parasites or Flatterers, of whom there was always great Store about his Majesty. As for the King, some of these Things related by *Buchanan* of Queen *Mary*, were transacted before he was born, others of them, when he was *Infans in Cunis vagiens*, as Mr. *Ruddiman* speaks (o); so that his Majesty could know nothing of these Affairs *ex propria scientia*, and he must have them from some of his Court-flatterers and Dependents.

I shall now present my Readers with a Letter from the illustrious President *Monf. de Thou* to Mr. *Camden*, so much the rather that Mr. *Ruddiman* has overlooked, or rather suppressed it in his Edition of *Buchanan's Works*. This illustrious Person, was one of the greatest Men of his Time. His History is, and ever will be, in the highest Esteem, while Learning subsists in the World. He is justly celebrated for his most excellent and amiable personal Character. He was a moderate *Roman Catholic*; a very great Lover of Truth, for such is his Character, not only from *Casaubon*, but from many others; a Man of the greatest Honour, swayed by no Interest, Party or Faction. In fine, he was as much Superior to *Camden*, to whom he directs his Letter,

(o) Series Reg. Scot. Chronologica, Pag. 90.

Letter, as the first Magistrate in *France* is, says *old Mixon*, to the lowest Schoolmaster in *England*.

Several other valuable Extracts of his Letters to *Camden*, relating to this Matter, might be adduced ; but at present I shall content myself with publishing this one entire : For tho' it was writ several Years before *Casaubon's* to him, yet it is in Effect a full Answer to it. This Letter from the President, contains an *Apology* for his following *Buchanan*, in what relates to *Queen Mary's* Reign ; and consequently it is an *Apology* for *Buchanan* too.

Viro Doctissimo, Gulielmo Camdeno, Jacobus Augustus Thuanus, S. D. (p).

“ **P**OST longum silentium, vir doctissime,
 “ mitto ad te, sive excusationis loco,
 “ sive ad purgandam moram, secundum
 “ historiarum nostrarum tomum ; sed valde
 “ vereor, ut *temperamentum* illud, de quo
 “ monueras, in rerum *Scoticarum* narratione
 “ ubique servaverim, rem in omnium ore
 “ positam omnino præterire ; quod liben-
 “ tissime fecissem, si licuisset, magnâ me
 “ invidiam apud vos deprecandi molestiâ
 “ nunc

(p) Vid. *Camdeni Epist.* a *Thoma Smitho* editas, N^o. 59. Londini, 1691, 4to.

“ nunc levatum sentirem. Verum in opère
 “ suscepto, nisi officio deesse vellem, æque
 “ mihi flagitiosum silentium, quam menda-
 “ cium ipsum fuit, vitandum. Quod si
 “ igitur id scribi oportuit, quomodo aliter
 “ scribi potuerit, fane non video. Nam
 “ criminis, quod ipse palam admiseris, cul-
 “ pam in alium ex suspicione rejicere, quid
 “ aliud est, quam reo periclitanti per ca-
 “ lumniosas exceptiones patrocinium para-
 “ re ? In reo, in ancipitis causæ defensore,
 “ quippe omnis expediendæ salutis hone-
 “ sta ratio, id excusationem forte mereat :
 “ At veritatem professo, ut alium culpâ li-
 “ beres alium infamiâ onerare nefas. Res
 “ ipsa loquitur. Nam demus, quod ab
 “ diversa tradentibus jactatur, *Moravium*
 “ ambitione ardentem, sceleratè regnum
 “ appetiisse : Quod tamen constanter ne-
 “ gant omnes fide digni Scoti, quoscunque
 “ mihi alloqui contingit ; etiam ii, quibus
 “ alioqui *Moravius* ob religionis causam
 “ summè invisus erat ; nam virum fuisse,
 “ aiebant, extra religionis causam, ab
 “ omni ambitione, avaritia & in quen-
 “ quam injuria alienum ; virtute, comitate,
 “ beneficiâ, vitæque innocentia præ-
 “ stantem, & qui nisi fuisset, eos, qui tan-
 “ topere mortuum exagitant, hodie mini-
 “ me rerum potituros fuisse. Sed demus
 “ illum,

“ illum, calcata omni divini humanique
 “ juris religione, tantum animo scelus con-
 “ cepisse, quo tandem consultore & adju-
 “ tore ad rem exsequendam usus est? Pri-
 “ mum omnium constat, nunquam ullas
 “ capitaliores inimicitias, quam inter *Mora-*
 “ *vium* & *Bothuelium* exarsisse. At quis
 “ sibi persuadeat, inter tam infestos de tan-
 “ to scelere, qualis in regem conjuratio fuit,
 “ consilia agitari potuisse; aut sperari, ut
 “ secretum, quod ad illam requirebatur,
 “ inter eos servaretur? Deinde, quis credat,
 “ *Moravium*, tantas cum *Bothuelio* inimici-
 “ tias exercentem, post patratum scelus,
 “ sorori, parricidæ in virum ducendi, aucto-
 “ rem fuisse? Aut reginam tam ingenio
 “ supino fingi posse, ut fratri, infames
 “ juxta & periculosas nuptias suadendi,
 “ aures præbuerit? Denique, cur *Moravius*,
 “ post hæc omnia, in Galliam secessit, si ex
 “ his turbis commodum aliquod sperare
 “ præsentia suâ potuit? Aut, cur postea
 “ revocatus tantâ fide, rege infante, reg-
 “ num administravit, & adversus *Hamilto-*
 “ *nios* imbecillam ejus ætatem tutatus est, si
 “ per regis calamitatem regni occupandi
 “ spem conceperit? Nam minus invidiosum
 “ & periculosum illi erat cum *Hamiltoniis*,
 “ si rem perfecissent, perduellibus de im-
 “ perio

"perio decertare, quam sororis filium, a
 "matre regnique ordinibus tutelæ suæ com-
 "missum opprimere. Postremo, quid
 "aliud, quæso, in caussa fuisse putas, cur
 "*Hamiltonii*, qui tyrannidem affectabant,
 "in *Moravii* necem conspiraverint, quam
 "quod, superstitæ tam strenuo regis infan-
 "tis regnique vindicæ, de successu despe-
 "rarent? Ex adverso apud animum tuum
 "reputa, familiarem plus quam oportuit,
 "reginæ, etiam ante parricidium, cum
 "*Bothuelio* consuetudinem, regis miseri aper-
 "tum, post *Rizii* cædem, odium, & ex eo
 "contemptum; Deinde post parricidium,
 "annitente regiina, festinatum de *Bothuelii*,
 "qui non solum facti suspectus, sed omnium
 "opinionē, quasi convictus, habebatur,
 "innocentiâ, iudicium, moxque dissolutas
 "turpiter *Bothuelii* cum *Gordonia* uxore
 "nuptias, ut alias mox turpiores contra-
 "heret. Nam raptum illum, quis non
 "rideat? Aut non potius ex his, quæ me-
 "moravimus, necessario colligat, ingentis
 "animi faminam, nisi suopte ingenio, &
 "præoccupata diu ante voluntate, ad id
 "fuiſſet inducta, nunquam tam facile in
 "illas nuptias fuisse consensuram, aut eas
 "postea, tam artificiosis literis apud nos
 "excusaturam? Verum hæc tecum, & semo-
 "tis arbitris. Nam quenquam accusare,

L

" aut

" aut illius defensionem fuscipere, neque
 " his brevibus literis, neque toto opere
 " nostro instituerim. Nam ab omni in-
 " sectatione & obtrectione, ut mens,
 " sic stylus abest : Et me plurima orationis
 " lenitate mollivisse, quæ alii acerbius scrip-
 " serant, ipsa lectione comperies. Rem,
 " ut ex *Scotorum*, qui interfuerunt, sermo-
 " nibus didici, ita literis, mandavi, & ad
 " eorum fidem scripta a *Buchanano* expendi.
 " De cætero nigrum in candidum, in cu-
 " jusquam gratiam convertere, neque ani-
 " mus ab initio fuit, neque nunc esse de-
 " buit. Itaque enixis precibus, quantum
 " possum, pro jure amicitiae nostræ a te
 " contendo, ut quoties in aula vestra inter
 " procures, & in amicorum colloquiis, de
 " me, deque fide nostra in scribenda histo-
 " ria mentio erit, toties horum *argumento-*
 " *rum* recorderis ; efficiasque, ut omnes in-
 " telligant, me sola muneris impositi ne-
 " cessitate coactum, quæ de ea rescripsi,
 " scripsisse ; Nam alioqui famæ gloriæque
 " *Anglo-Scotici* nominis ex animo favere ;
 " & hæc ipsa, quæ scripsi, sepulta maluisse,
 " nisi jam ante publica fama, & aliorum
 " scriptis innotuissent. Interim tibi sum-
 " mas gratias ago, pro *Hibernicarum* rerum
 " fragmento ad me misso, quod suo loco
 " insertum videbis ; & quoniam te tam
 " offi-

" officiosum expertus sum, rogare non du-
 " bitabo, ut eandem diligentiam, quam
 " antea non rogatus adhibuisti, in his re-
 " censendis adhibeas; & me per literas,
 " quantum tibi a *Britannia* tua, quam avi-
 " disime expectamus, otii supererit, amice
 " ut fecisti monens. Vale, mi *Camdene*, &
 " me amare perge."

Lutetiae Parisiorum, Pridie Kal. Vtil.
 cicioc. vi.

Dr. *Smith*, who publishes this among
Camden's Letters, was a High-flier, by no
 means friendly to *Buchanan's* Principles,
 religious or political, yet he has acted a
 candid and honest Part, in publishing this
 Letter. I could wish I could say the same
 Thing for Mr. *Ruddiman*; for, as he has
 with a good deal of Parade given his Read-
 er, in his Preface, *Isaac Casaubon's* Letter
 against *Buchanan*, it would have been fair
 to have given, in like Manner, *Monf.*
De Thou's Letter to *Camden* upon the same
 Affair; but this would not have answered
 the Design of discrediting *Buchanan* and his
 History. It is most certain, that Mr.
Ruddiman had *Smith's* Edition of *Camden's*
 Letters, for he quotes it in the End of his
 Annotations on *Buchanan's* History, and
 gives us from it, *Camden's* Animadversions

on that Part of *Thuan's* History that relates to *Scottish* Affairs. The Editor of *Buckley's* Edition of that History says, that Mr. *Rudiman* was mistaken in calling them *Camden's*, for that they were King *James's* Animadversions, in the Hand-writing of *Isaac Casaubon*. To me it is a *Lis de Lana Caprina*, whether they be the *King's*, *Camden's* or *Casaubon's*, they are so trifling and mean. For my Part, from the Fourth Note, I should take them for *Casaubon's*, because there he speaks of a private and familiar Conference he had with *Monf. de Thou* about the Earl of *Murray*.

The Words are, " Scio & probe memini,
 " præses amplissime, dixisse te mihi sæpius,
 " cum in familiari colloquio sermo de hoc
 " *Moravio* incidisset, omnia te expertum,
 " ut harum rerum veritatem sedula inquiri-
 " tione invenires? neque aliud comperisse
 " multis interrogatis quam quod scripsisti.
 " *i. e.* Illustrious President, I know, and
 " very well remember, that you told me
 " often, when in a familiar Conversation,
 " the Discourse was about this *Murray*,
 " that you had tried every Thing, to find
 " out the Truth of these Things by a dili-
 " gent Enquiry; and that you found no
 " other Thing than what you have wrote,
 " after

“after the many Questions you had made
 “about it.” This by the By, confirms
 what is asserted in the preceeding Letter to
Camden. Now it is pretty certain King
James never saw *Monf. de Thou*, and as
 little did *Camden*, for he never was out of
England. And I wonder much, that Mr.
Ruddiman did not think of this, otherwise
 he had never been misled by Dr. *Smith*, to
 call them *Camden's Animadversions*; and
 there is as little Reason for the other to call
 them the Kings.

Now follows the *Translation* of the pre-
 ceeding Letter.

JACOBUS AUGUSTUS THUANUS,
To the Very Learned WILLIAM
 CAMDEN.

“AFTER long Silence, Learned Sir,
 “I send you the second Tome of my
 “History, either in way of Excuse, or to
 “clear me of my Delay in writing you:
 “But I'm greatly afraid, I have not every
 “where observed that *Moderation*, you
 “advised me to, in the Narration of
 “the *Scottish* Affairs; If I could alto-
 “gether have passed over that Matter,
 “which

" which is in every Body's Mouth, and
 " which I very much inclined to, I now
 " should find myself eased of the great
 " Trouble of removing the Odium I may
 " have incurred with you. But in a Work
 " I had undertaken, a *scandalous Silence* was
 " as much to be shunned by me, as a Lie
 " itself, unless I should be wanting in my
 " Duty as an *Historian*. If therefore this
 " Affair, behoved to be narrated, in Truth
 " I don't see, how otherwise it could be
 " told: For, to throw the Blame of a
 " Crime, which you yourself have openly
 " committed, upon another from Suspicion,
 " what else is it, than to contrive a Defence
 " for an arraigned Person in Danger of his
 " Life, by slanderous Exceptions? In a
 " Person impeached, in a Defender of a
 " dangerous Cause, every Way to save the
 " Life, is justifiable to be sure, that possi-
 " bly may deserve an Excuse: But for one
 " that professes the Truth, it is unlawful
 " to load one with Infamy, that you may
 " free the other of the Crime. The Thing
 " itself says so. For, let us suppose, what
 " is said by those who give a different Ac-
 " count of this Matter, that the Earl of
 " *Murray*, flaming with Ambition, wick-
 " edly aimed at the Kingdom; which ne-
 " vertheless all the credible *Scotsmen*, I have
 " con-

“ conversed with, constantly deny ; even
 “ those who hated *Murray* greatly on the
 “ Score of Religion : For they said he was
 “ a Man, abstracting from Religion, averse
 “ to all Ambition, Avarice or Injury to any
 “ one ; excelling for Virtue, Affability,
 “ Beneficence and Innocence of Life ; and
 “ if he had not been such, that those, who
 “ so much abuse him when dead, would
 “ not at this Day been sitting on the
 “ Throne. But let us suppose him, despising
 “ all the Obligation of the Laws of God and
 “ Man, to have contrived in his Mind so
 “ great a Wickedness, who pray did he
 “ make Use of for his Adviser and Assistant
 “ in executing that Matter ? *First* of all it is
 “ known, that there never was a more mor-
 “ tal Enmity, than what was betwixt *Mur-*
 “ *ray* and *Bothwell*. But who can persuade
 “ himself, that Contrivances could be ma-
 “ naged betwixt such mortal Enemies, a-
 “ bout so great a Villany, as was the Con-
 “ spiracy against the King ; or that it could
 “ be expected, that the Secret, which was
 “ necessary for carrying it on, could be
 “ kept betwixt them ? In the *next* Place,
 “ who can believe that *Murray*, having
 “ such Enmity at *Bothwell*, after the Wick-
 “ edness was perpetrated, would advise his
 “ Sister to marry the Murderer ? Or, that
 “ the

“ the Queen can be supposed to have been
 “ of so indolent a Disposition, as to
 “ listen to her Brother, advising her to a
 “ Marriage, equally infamous and dangerous?
 “ *In fine*, why did *Murray*, after all
 “ this, retire into *France*, if by his Presence
 “ he could hope for any Advantage
 “ from these Confusions? Or, when called
 “ home, why managed he the Kingdom,
 “ during the Infancy of the King,
 “ with such Faithfulness, and defended his
 “ tender Age against the *Hamiltons*, if by
 “ the King’s Destruction he conceived
 “ Hopes of seizing on the Kingdom? For
 “ it was less odious and dangerous for him
 “ to contend with the *Hamiltons*, Traitors
 “ to the State, if they had accomplished
 “ the Matter, than to make away with his
 “ Sister’s Son, committed to his Guardianship
 “ by the Mother and the States of the
 “ Kingdom. *Lastly*, What other Reason,
 “ I beseech you, do you imagine there
 “ was, why the *Hamiltons*, who aimed at
 “ the Sovereignty, conspired against the
 “ Earl of *Murray*’s Life, than that they
 “ despaired of Success, while so strenuous
 “ a Defender of the Infant King and Kingdom
 “ was alive? On the other Hand,
 “ consider in your own Mind the Queen’s
 “ too familiar Intimacy with *Bothwell*,
 “ even

“ even before the Murder was committed;
 “ her open Hatred of the poor King, after
 “ *Rizio's* Murder; and thereafter her Con-
 “ tempt of him. In the *next* Place, after
 “ the King was murdered, what Hurry
 “ there was, the Queen using all her In-
 “ terest and Efforts for that Purpose, to
 “ have *Bothwell* acquit, who not only was
 “ suspected to be guilty of that Crime; but
 “ also in the Opinion of all, was look'd
 “ upon as convicted thereof; and *Both-*
 “ *well's* immediately after scandalously dis-
 “ solving his Marriage with the Lady *Gor-*
 “ *don* his Wife, that he might afterwards
 “ contract another Marriage more scanda-
 “ lous. For who does not laugh at her
 “ being carried away by Force? Or, who
 “ does not rather infer, from these Things
 “ I have already mentioned; that this high
 “ spirited Woman, if she had not been
 “ induced to it, of her own proper Inclina-
 “ tion, and with a prepossess'd Affection
 “ long before, would never so easily have
 “ consented to that Marriage, or would
 “ have endeavour'd afterwards to excuse
 “ it at our Court in her so cunning
 “ and artful Letters? But these Things I
 “ write to yourself, and without any Per-
 “ son being present as a Witness. For I
 “ never intended to accuse any one, or un-

M

“ dertake

“ dertake any one's Defence, either in this
 “ short Letter, or in the whole of my
 “ Work. As my Mind, so my Manner
 “ of Writing, is far from inveighing a-
 “ gainst, or disparaging any one: And
 “ you'll find in the reading of my History,
 “ that I have softned with the greatest
 “ Mildness of Stile, what others had writ
 “ with greater Bitterness. I have so nar-
 “ rated the Affair, as I learnt it from the
 “ Conversation of *Scotsmen* who were upon
 “ the Spot, and according to their Faith,
 “ I have examined what *Buchanan* has
 “ wrote. For the rest, to turn black into
 “ white, to gratify any one, was never my
 “ Intention from the Beginning, nor now
 “ ought it to be: And therefore, with all
 “ the Earnestness I can, I beg of you, in
 “ Right of the Friendship betwixt us, that
 “ whensoever there shall be mention of
 “ me, and of my Sincerity in writing my
 “ History, at your Court, among the No-
 “ bility, or in the Conversation of Friends,
 “ you'll as oft call to Remembrance these
 “ Arguments I have now adduced; and
 “ make them all know, that I, obliged by
 “ the Necessity of my Profession, as an
 “ Historian, have wrote what I have nar-
 “ rated on this Affair; for otherwise I have
 “ a sincere Regard for the Reputation
 “ and

" and Glory of the *English-Scotish* Name;
 " and that I very much inclined, that these
 " Things I have writ, had been buried, if
 " they had not been long ago known to
 " the World by publick Fame, and the
 " Writings of others. Mean while, I
 " return you my hearty Thanks for the
 " Fragment of the *Irish* Affairs you sent
 " me, which you shall see insert in its pro-
 " per Place: And because I have found
 " you so very obliging, I'll make no Scruple
 " to entreat you'll give the same Diligence
 " in reviewing what is now sent you, as
 " you gave before when not asked so to
 " do; and advise me friendly by Letter, as
 " you have hitherto done, and as the Lei-
 " sure you may have from your *Britannia*,
 " which I impatiently expect, will permit.
 " Farewell my dear *Camden*, and continue
 " your Regard for me. From *Paris*, the
 " 31 July 1606."

Ever since *Camden's* Days, our high-flying
 Writers, have been perpetually throwing
 up against *Buchanan*, that his History and
 Dialogue *de Regno*, were condemned by the
 Parliament of *Scotland*, Anno 1584, about
 2 Years after *Buchanan's* Death. But when
 the Complexion of that Parliament is
 known, and by whose Councils every
 Thing

Thing was managed at that Time, neither *Buchanan* suffers by it, nor the Cause he maintains. Plainly, it was a very unfrequent and pack'd up Meeting, under the Direction of Captain *James Stuart*, who was in great Credit with the King then, and his principal Favourite. As for his Character, Sir *James Melvil*, who knew him very well, says, Mem. Pag. 263, "That he was a Scorner of Religion, pre-
 sumptuous, ambitious, covetous, careless of the Commonwealth, a Despiser of the Nobility, and of all honest Men." Bishop *Spotswood* gives him as bad a Character. *Adamson*, that Sycophant and Court-flatterer, was the Tool Captain *Stuart* employed in framing that Act. Of all the Writers who mention this Act, none seems to take greater Satisfaction in the Relation of it. than Bishop *Nicolson*, who, Pag. 14, after he has given us a great Part of the Act itself, and told us of the Answers to *Buchanan's* Treatise, he at last gives us an Account of the *Oxford* Decree 1683, wherein were asserted the Doctrine of Passive-obedience, the absolute, indefeasible, and hereditary Right of Succession to the Crown. By this wild and infamous Decree, *Buchanan's De jure Regni* was condemn'd, and, with others of the same Principles,

ciples, appointed to be publicly burnt. But *Buchanan* was sufficiently revenged on that learned and high-flying Body, and the Honour of the *British* Constitution was abundantly afterwards repaired, when the *House of Lords*, *Anno* 1710, ordered this *Oxford* Decree to be burnt by the Hands of the common Hangman, before the *Royal Exchange*, in Presence of the Lord Mayor of the City of *London*, and of the Sheriffs of *London* and *Middlesex*; and I doubt not but the Bishop of *Carlisle* joined in this Order, for he was not then, nor for some Years thereafter, translated to the See of *Derry* in *Ireland*: I am the more convinced of this, from his Dedication of his *Irish* Historical Library, where he commends the People of *Derry*, “for their ever memorable and successful STAND, which they made against the then prevailing Inroads of *Popery* and arbitrary Power.”

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

Title Page, for *χαιου*, read *χαιισο*. P. 57. Line 9:
read *nostra*. P. 61. l. 22. r. *Commendatur*.
Thro' Neglect, the Paging is not exact, but there is nothing wanting.

